

THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

Edited by Peter Ainslie, Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.
Editorial Council: Raymond Calkins, Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.; Alfred E. Garvie, Principal New College, London, England; Hughell Fosbroke, Dean General Theological Seminary, New York; William P. Merrill, Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City; George W. Richards, Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

JULY, 1920

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
 Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai
 Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of
Christ. It is issued in January, April, July and October.

Vol. X.

JULY, 1920

No. 1

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:

THE SWITZERLAND CONFERENCES OF THIS SUMMER	9
NOTES AND COMMENTS	12
UNITY IN THE MISSION FIELD. ROBERT E. SPEER	16
PRESENT POSSIBILITIES AND FUTURE STEPS TOWARDS UNITY. T. J. PULVERTAFT	26
PAUL'S PLAN FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY. JOHN B. COWDEN	33
SOME FALLACIES CONCERNING CHURCH UNITY AND A HOPEFUL PLAN. ROBERT WESTLY PEACH	49
SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS AND CONGREGATIONAL- ISTS	56
CHRISTIAN UNITY IN AUSTRALIA. GEORGE HALL	60
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY	63
BOOK REVIEWS	79

THIS JOURNAL IS INTERDENOMINATIOAL AND INTERNA-
TIONAL and is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or
creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a
frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with
the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance
should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK



ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

INTERCHURCH WORLD MOVEMENT OF NORTH AMERICA, 1919, Chairman Executive Committee, John R. Mott, New York; General Secretary, S. Earl Taylor, 920 Broadway, New York. For giving and accomplishing an adequate programme for Protestantism in the world.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

AT THE instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Pentecost Sunday has been named primarily as the day for special sermons on Christian unity in all Churches, along with prayers to that end.

WORLD'S STUDENT CHRISTIAN FEDERATION, Sweden, July 30-August 10.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE, July and August.

PRELIMINARY meeting of a proposed ecumenical conference of Church Federations and allied interests at Geneva, Switzerland, August 9-11. For particulars write Rev. Chas. S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22nd St., New York, Secretary.

PRELIMINARY meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Geneva, Switzerland, August 12. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, St. Beatenberg, Switzerland, August 20th. Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, Secretary.

Bibliography of Christian Unity

THE BOOKS included in this list are by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Lutherans, Baptists, Disciples of Christ, etc.

CHRISTIAN UNION, Van Dyke, Appleton, 1885.....	\$1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION, Garrison, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1906	1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION IN EFFORT, Firth, Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1911..	1.50
CHRISTIAN UNION IN SOCIAL SERVICE, Carlile, London, Clarke & Co., 1913	2/6
CHRISTIAN UNITY, Briggs, Scribner, 1900.....	1.00
CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK, Macfarland, Federal Council.....	1.00
CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY, Grane, Macmillan, 1916....	2.00
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS ADVOCATING CHRISTIAN UNION, Young, Chicago, The Christian Century Co., 1904.....	1.00
HOW TO PROMOTE CHRISTIAN UNION, Kershner, Cincinnati, The Standard Publishing Co., 1916.....	1.00
LECTURES ON THE REUNION OF THE CHURCH, Döllinger, Dodd, 1872	1.50
LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN COÖPERATION (Federal Council) Macfarland. 5 Vols.	5.00
OUR PLEA FOR UNION AND THE PRESENT CRISIS, Willett, Chicago, Christian Century Co.	.50
PASSING PROTESTANTISM AND COMING CATHOLICISM, Smyth, Scribner, 1908	1.00
PROGRESS OF CHURCH FEDERATION, Macfarland, Revell.....	.50
RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1908	
RESTATEMENT AND REUNION, Streeter, Macmillan, 1914.....	.75
SOME THOUGHTS OF CHRISTIAN REUNION, Carpenter, Macmillan, 1895	1.25
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNITY IN CHRISTENDOM, Turner, London, Elliott Stock, 1895.....	
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Wells, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905....	.75
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Whyte, Armstrong, 1907	.25
THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, Campbell, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1890	1.00
THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS UNITY, Kelly, Longmans, 1913.....	1.50
THE CHURCHES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL, Macfarland, Revell....	1.00
THE LARGER CHURCH, Lanier, Fredericksburg, Va.	1.25
THE LEVEL PLAN FOR CHURCH UNION, Brown, Whittaker, 1910....	1.50
THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Cobb, Crowell, 1915.....	1.25
THE MESSAGE OF THE DISCIPLES FOR THE UNION OF THE CHURCH, Ainslie, Revell, 1913.....	1.00
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, McComas, Revell, 1912....	1.25
THE SEVENFOLD UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Hall, Longmans, 1911	.75
THE UNION OF CHRISTIAN FORCES IN AMERICA, Ashworth, Philadelphia. American Sunday-School Union, 1915.....	.75
THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, Shields, Scribner, 1895	2.50
THOUGHTS OF THE PRESENT POSITION OF PROTESTANTISM, Harnack, Macmillan, 1899	1.00
UNITY AND MISSIONS, Brown, Revell, 1915.....	1.50
WHAT MUST THE CHURCH DO TO BE SAVED? Simms, Revell, 1913..	1.50

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Greek, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

MEDITATION:

On our need of patience with each other in our approaches toward Christian unity.

On our need of faith that God will bring to pass the triumph of His will on the earth.

On our need of the sense of appreciation of all work that has for its end the glory of God.

On the Switzerland conferences and all summer conferences that have to do with the coöperation of Christians and the unity of the Church.

ASSURANCE:

How wonderful is the way in which, with quite ordinary folk, power leaps to our aid in any time of emergency. We lead timid lives, shrinking from difficult tasks, till, perhaps, we are forced into them or ourselves determine on them, and immediately we seem to unlock the unseen forces. When we have to face danger, then courage comes; when trial puts a long continued strain upon us we find ourselves possessed by the power to endure; or when disaster ultimately brings the fall which we so long dreaded, we feel underneath us the strength as of the everlasting arms. Common experience teaches that, when great demands are made upon us, if only we fearlessly accept the challenge and confidently expend our strength, every danger or difficulty brings its own strength.—“As thy days, so shall thy strength be.”—*The Spirit (The Psychology of Power.)* Edited by Canon Streeter.

PRAYER:

ALMIGHTY FATHER, Who art always faithful, look in mercy upon us in our unfaithfulness and lead us away from the shrines of idolatry and the sins of the flesh into the holiness of Thy fellowship. Teach us the way to faith, hope and love until we shall express these in terms that are so distinctively Christian that the world shall know we have been with Christ; through Him, Whose we are and Whom we serve. Amen.

THREE QUESTIONS CONCERNING UNITY

Ask yourselves these questions. Can a united church find its mind and the mind of Christ better than a divided church? And the answer is not in doubt.

Can a united church find its voice and utter the voice of Christ better than a broken and dismembered church? And the answer is not in doubt.

Can one church—one in its passion, one in its spirit, one in its devotion, one in its opposition to all evil, one in its consecration to all good, be used by Christ, the Head of the Church, in the world's movement more effectually than can the broken and dismembered portions of such a church? The answer is not in doubt.—*Bishop W. F. McDowell of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*

Christian Unity Possibilities

It is altogether possible for the Church of this generation to find the paths of unity. History is abundant with instances of the change of the thought of a whole nation in a single generation. There are more evidences for this possibility regarding unity than there were for those possibilities regarding the change of thought in matters of philosophy, science and ethics. God can create new forces when the will of man is humble and penitent. The need for unity among Christians is the greatest need of the world.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME X.

Among New Books.....	79, 158, 236, 319
Appeal to All Christian People, an.....	89
Bases of Unity, The. Gaius Glenn Atkins.....	179
Christian Unity in Australia. George Hall.....	60
Declaration of Principals Concerning the Lutheran Church and Its Ex- ternal Relationship. Being the Action of the Recent Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America.....	188
Disciples' Programme for Union, The. George W. Brown.....	121
Dogmatic Versus the Experimental Approach to Union, The. Alva W. Taylor.....	276
Fourth Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council—Editorial.....	215
Has the Denominational School a Place in Present Day Education? Peter Ainslie	289
Inquiry Concerning the World's Waiting and our Tarrying, An. Being Addressed to the Editor by Anthony Openeye.....	211
Interpretation of the Lambeth Appeal, An. Ethelbert Talbot.....	169
Letters to the Editor.....	156, 230, 317
Notes and Comments.....	12
Outlook for Christian Unity, The. Joseph A. Vance.....	258
Paul's Plan for Christian Unity. John B. Cowden.....	33
Pilgrimage toward Unity, A. Charles H. Brent.....	117
Practical Steps Toward Christian Reunion. Arthur C. Headlam.....	249
Present Possibilities and Future Steps Towards Unity. T. J. Pulvertaft	26
Priest or Prophet? A Question for the Day. W. H. Griffith Thomas.....	105
Re-establishment of Christian Peace, The. Being the Encycle of Pope Benedict XV.....	201
St. Louis Conference, The—Editorial	305
Scottish Church Reunion. Robert Forgan.....	94
Some Fallacies Concerning Church Unity and a Hopeful Plan. Robert Westly Peach.....	49
Suggestions Concerning Conferences Between the Protestant Episcopal- ians and Congregationalists.....	56
Switzerland Conference of This Summer, The—Editorial.....	9
Three Outstanding Conferences—Editorial.....	129
Towards Christian Unity. Alexander Ramsay.....	269
Unity in the Mission Field. Robert E. Speer.....	16
What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity.....	63, 140, 220, 309

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Vol. X.

JULY, 1920

No. 1

EDITORIAL

THE SWITZERLAND CONFERENCES OF THIS SUMMER

IN THE month of August two important conferences dealing with Christian unity will be held at Geneva, Switzerland, and one dealing with international friendship will be held at St. Beatenberg, Switzerland, which indirectly approaches the unity of the Church.

The first is a preliminary meeting of a proposed ecumenical conference. A call to this effect was issued in the autumn of 1914 by the neutral countries in war time through the Federal Council in the United States of America and through representatives of the Church in Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Holland, and later this call included two bishops in belligerent countries—Archbishop of Finland and Bishop Ferenez of Transylvania. In 1917 the Archbishop of Uppsala, the bishops of Seeland, Denmark, and Christiania, Norway, issued an invitation to an ecumenical conference, which was cordially received by orthodox and evangelical parts of the Church, only the Roman Catholics declining. Cardinal Gasparri, however, wrote on behalf of the pope. War conditions made it impossible to hold the conference at that time. The invitation was twice repeated in 1918, but war conditions again made it impossible. Similar movements were in other countries. In 1916 the Federal Council in

America took definite action. In 1917 two efforts were made on the part of the British—one through the British Council, which was founded to promote an international Christian meeting, and the other through the British branch of the World Alliance; likewise similar efforts came from Hungary and Switzerland. With this background this preliminary meeting promises to be of worth.

It begins with evangelical Christians only or the Protestant part of the Church, which will be the first attempt at an ecumenical conference in the history of Protestantism. Its field of action is different from that of the World Conference on Faith and Order. It will prepare for it and supplement it but the ecumenical conference will not deal with matters of faith and order. Instead it will deal with well-defined, practical aims in the realm of moral or social questions where all Christians can begin at once to act together.

Following this will be the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order, which had its origin in the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America in 1910. A commission was appointed with Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, D.D., of Chicago, president; Rev. W. T. Manning, D.D., rector of Trinity Church, New York, chairman of the Executive Committee; George Zabriskie, D.C.L., New York, treasurer, and Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, secretary. This commission has done a fine piece of statesmanship work. Three deputations have been sent abroad—the first to the Church of England, the second to the non-Anglican Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, and the third to the continental Churches. Seventy commissions from as many communions have been appointed to take part in the World Conference, only the Roman Catholic Church declining the invitation. The Episcopal commission has moved cautiously. They have not been in a hurry and have thereby advanced further than

had they been in a hurry, for Christian unity cannot be hurried. It must grow. Mr. Gardiner has conducted a wide correspondence with all communions in all parts of the world.

This preliminary conference is not to decide questions of faith and order. These may be discussed, but this conference is preliminary to the World Conference, which is to be held at some time and place to be designated. Such a conference will extend over months. This will extend only from the 12th to the 20th of August. But in this conference there will doubtless be outlined plans covering the whole field of the World Conference, such as representation, subjects for discussion and finances, the appointing of an *ad interim* committee, which shall work constantly until the conference convenes, and many other things that fall naturally to a preliminary meeting. The preparation indicates a meeting of vast consequence to the unity of the Church.

The third conference will deal with international friendship. The first of these conferences was held last year at The Hague. A report of it was given in THE QUARTERLY of January of this year. This will be the meeting of the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, which had its beginning in 1914. The meeting of last year at The Hague was the first attempt after the war to retie the broken threads of international friendship. This meeting ought to go considerably further than that of last year and doubtless it will. The bringing together of representatives from so many nations, dealing with the great social problems, may be welcomed as the beginning of a new day, when many contributions are being made for the permanent peace of the world.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WITH this number THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY opens its tenth volume and at the same time in its interdenominational and international service the following distinguished persons have been added to its Board of Editorial Council: Rev. Raymond Calkins, D.D., pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.; Principal Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., New College, London, England; Dean Hughell Fosbroke, D.D., of the General Theological Seminary, New York, Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D., Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City, and Professor George W. Richards, D.D., Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa. Other names will be added to the board later. THE QUARTERLY belongs to all who are interested in the unity of the Church, however widely we may differ regarding the method of approach.

The Interchurch World Movement started right. Its purpose as stated by the Committee of Twenty was "To present a unified programme of Christian service and to unite the Protestant Churches of North America in the performance of their common task, thus making available the values of spiritual power which come from unity and coördination of Christian effort and meeting the unique opportunities of the new era." That was well said, and had the movement stuck to its original purpose it would have had opposition, bitter opposition from every sectarian quarter, but the possibilities of a united Protestantism would have been permanently advanced. Instead the Interchurch World Movement could rise only as high as the denominations are and therefore it became a denominational movement, each denomination driving for its millions of dollars in order to make its denomination stronger than ever, making the purpose of the Interchurch World Movement the opposite of that which appeared to have been its original purpose. There is no

denomination in Christendom that can be trusted with great sums of money without that denomination's using that money for its own denominational interest and therefore retarding the progress of Christian unity.

The Interchurch World Movement was a by-product of the World War and it partook fully of the characteristics of the governmental drives for loans and securing recruits for the army. The armies of the allies, however, started in division and ended in unity. The Interchurch World Movement started in unity and ended in division, each denomination driving for itself and its denominational interests. A united patriotism could put over governmental affairs, but a divided Church could not put over its programme, from which there ought to be a significant lesson. However, some of the features of unification were not entirely lost, such as the mass meetings and surveys, and these will exhibit the increasing failure of a divided Christendom. It is to be hoped that there will be such survival of these good elements that when the Interchurch Movement discovers itself it may be courageous enough to definitely advise against overlapping of Churches in designated communities and advise with equal definiteness the unifying of denominational colleges in order that education may be taken out of its denominational moulds, giving young men and young women of this generation a chance of fellowship with the whole Church. Of the movement *The Christian Century*, Chicago, says,

“But the real cause, as was apparent to all who faced the situation, the thing of which least was said in the open session, was the denominational spirit that from the first doomed the Movement to a limited success, and threatened a complete failure. More than once the leaders spoke candidly of this fundamental weakness of the plan as it was developed. Yet they spoke without heat, as those who long ago discovered that they had been set to do a great work, and then deprived of the only asset by which it could hope for real success—actual unity of effort.

“When two years ago the missionary leaders sat down together and studied the opportunity and responsibility of the post-war situation, they saw that two things were essential to the attainment of the vast objective of effective Protestant service in the new days of peril ahead—days far more difficult than those of the war. Those two things were a careful

survey of the entire field, and a concerted campaign to finance the splendid task of meeting the needs disclosed. The vision took the form, fair and inspiring, of the united Churches rousing themselves to achieve the united work. It was said at that time by one of the most influential leaders in the American Church that in a cause so holy and so compelling there was compulsion in the thought of a unified adventure, and that no dollar of the funds raised should be spent in merely sectarian ways, or without the approval of all.

"It was that conception of the plan which first attracted the sympathetic attention of the Christian public, and fired the imagination of the people. The assurance that the age of sectarian rivalry was closing, and that the Churches actually could counsel and campaign together was alluring and convincing. It kindled a real glow of satisfaction all over the land. If the enterprise could have been carried through on that high level, a very different sequel would have been recorded.

"But a beginning had hardly been made before the self-interest of denominationalism was disclosed as an obstruction. One after another several of the coöperating bodies served notice that for one reason and another they found it impossible to agree to the original plan. One had just made a financial drive, and could not repeat the process for some time to come, though it has since discovered that it is both necessary and practicable to put on almost at once a greater drive than the first one. Another found that objection to the Movement as a united plan was so pronounced in its ranks that only a solemn covenant that it should be permitted to conduct its own campaign in its own way cleared the path for any participation at all. Other denominations found equally convincing reasons for lending only a partial support. So instead of a united programme and a concerted drive for funds, the Interchurch World Movement was compelled to content itself with a "united simultaneous" campaign, a deliberately confusing and self-annihilating term.

"Every friend of coöperative work in America, every Christian who longs for the progress of the Church, and fears the reaction that may come from any apparent failure of great plans, will be much in prayer for the divine blessing upon the men and women who are leading in this impressive work. It must not be allowed to fail of its purpose. Such an issue would retard the work of Christianity a generation. What is needed is the quiet and humbling mastery of the lesson of the futility of divided effort and the longing of men and women of good will throughout the nation for a real joining of the forces that claim fellowship with our Lord in the imperial tasks to which he is summoning his Church."

In all problems having to do with the unity of the Church we must stand out firmly, but kindly, for unity. One may be subjected to severe criticism from the conservative element in his own party, and from all parties for that matter, but unity can only come by boldly discounting the present order and with equal boldness seeking for the paths of unity. We must be fair to the other man's point of view. We must try to put ourselves in his place. We must remember that he is our brother and because he is our brother schism is sin; but we need not

be hesitating whether we should take a stand for unity. Halting advocates of a cause do not get very far.

Unity must come and it will come when every opportunity is used to emphasize in no uncertain phrasing, as in his address to the synod of his diocese the bishop of Montreal said, "*Only a Church united can fully present Christ to the needs of mankind.*" When that is said by ten thousand pulpits ten million times the people will look for action and they will not be disappointed.

The American Council on Organic Union of the evangelical Churches of America is proposing a definite union. Some will favor it, like the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by appointing an authorized commission on that subject; also the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., by directing the presbyteries to vote on it; likewise both the Reformed Church in the U. S. and the Reformed Church in the U. S. A., directing the classes to act. Others will follow these. Some will reject the proposal. A few of the stronger bodies going ahead will make the road smooth enough for the more hesitating bodies to follow. President Henry Churchill King wrote in a recent number of *The Congregationalist*, Boston, as follows:

"I do not myself hesitate to say that the action of the Council seems to me to be *the most hopeful step yet taken toward the organic union of the Churches of Christ in America.* If that is even partly true, this movement deserves our most careful attention.

"It should be said, from the first, that the results were not due to any sudden enthusiasm created by emotional appeals of any kind. On the contrary, our Congregational delegation—and quite evidently other delegations as well—came without much expectation of particularly significant results. We were ready to listen respectfully, and then to admit that nothing vital could be done. But the impression steadily grew upon us all, in the course of the Conference, that a great event was taking place; that the committee on the 'Plan of Union' had been guided by the Spirit of God, and had done a remarkable piece of work; and that the members of the Council themselves showed so rare a freedom from selfishness and pretense, and so fine a spirit of Christian fellowship coupled with honest facing of the facts, as to bear witness to the presence of God in their deliberations."

UNITY IN THE MISSION FIELD

BY ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., SECRETARY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF
FOREIGN MISSIONS, NEW YORK.

I WISH to speak of the measure in which coöperation and unity have been already achieved in the foreign missionary field, for there, more than in any other field of Christian endeavor and fellowship, have we made progress toward these goals. In the first place we have dispensed with the names that help to keep us asunder in the West. God be praised, many of these names are incapable of translation into the languages of the non-Christian world. You cannot translate Presbyterian or Methodist or Protestant Episcopal into Chinese. There are very few languages in the world in which you can find any terms that by any stretch of the imagination can be made the equivalent of these. Missionaries accordingly have devised terms and names that fit one body of Christians just as well as they fit any other body of Christians. And we have not only taken the names off our denominational organizations there, but we have taken them off many forms of our effort. We have established schools and colleges and most of them bear no denominational name. They may bear the name of some Christian character, but they very seldom bear any denominational name. We are doing our work in the great non-Christian field under the Christian name alone. There are fields like the Philippines, where almost all of the Christian churches came together and where they agreed on one single name by which they would call all of their organizations, the Church of Christ, perhaps, and then parenthetically at the end they would put in Presbyterian or Methodist. But the parenthesis has been happily dropping out here and there and only the Christian name stands out to view. We have carried the Gospel of Christ and the Church of Christ out into the non-Christian world and a great many of these names

we have left behind, and having left the names behind, it has been easier to leave some of the things which the names connote behind and by which we are held apart.

In the second place, in the foreign mission field they have adopted the policy of wise distribution of the forces that were available for the missionary work. Men have seen the absurdity and wrong of crowding little groups of Christian workers into one single section while great areas went absolutely uncared for. And wise and sensible men, in whom the Christian spirit worked, have begun to apportion this task among themselves. The underlying principle was expressed in one of the deliverances of the Church of England not long ago in the Lambeth Conference of 1887: "That in the foreign mission field of the Church's work where signal spiritual blessings have attended the labor of Christian missionaries not connected with the Anglican community a special obligation has arisen to avoid, as far as possible without compromise of principle, whatever tends to prevent the due growth and manifestation of that 'unity of the Spirit,' which should ever mark the Church of Christ." And there are very few missionaries now who are not of the same mind with Alexander Duff, who said that he would as soon leap into the Ganges as take one step to entice a Christian believer away from another Christian body or to do work that fell in the natural sphere and was the duty of any other Christian organization.

Here in this city long years ago the principle was laid down on the occasion of Alexander Duff's visit, long since forgotten but living in the memory for generations of those who heard him. I have talked with old men, long since dead, who attended that meeting held on the occasion of Alexander Duff's visit and who voted for the resolutions that were adopted then:

"Resolved, That considering the vast extent of the yet

unevangelized world of heathenism, and the limited means of evangelization at the disposal of the existing evangelical Churches or societies, it would be very desirable that with the exception of great centers, such as the capitals of powerful kingdoms, an efficient pre-occupancy of any particular portion of the heathen field by an evangelical Church or society should be respected and left in their undisturbed possession."

It was in accordance with these principles that the Mexico missionaries some years ago after the revolution decided not to go back to their old methods, but that they would see that the whole country was apportioned so that great areas were no longer neglected as they had been by the congesting of forces in certain areas and leaving others untouched. And now a map of Mexico may be presented showing that whole country portioned out, not with the idea of exclusion, but on the principle of taking care of the whole task that must be done, and, with the exception of two Christian bodies which retain still their claim of right to leap over all these boundaries and go anywhere, all the rest of the Christian organizations are now doing their best to see that the whole of Mexico is properly taken care of. That is the second great achievement in the foreign mission field.

In the third place, the foreign mission work has led all other Christian activities in the way it has developed confidence and coöperation among all the forces engaged in it. Here in New York City we began thirty years ago an annual conference of all the foreign missionary boards of the United States and Canada. It has been held annually ever since, and it has enabled the missionary agencies in the United States and Canada to approach their task with a common body of principles and with an almost common body of resources. In almost every mission field now agencies of the same kind have been developed, agencies of coöperation and confidence. In In-

dia the Anglican Church has been foremost in the great movement that has correlated the forces of India. And all of these bodies, except the Roman communion, are correlating their purposes and laying out their plans not in isolation but in common conference and brotherly accord.

In the fourth place, there has been in the mission field for a hundred years now such a volume of united prayer ascending from men and women as has arisen from no other section of the Christian Church. What we call the Week of Prayer, long since diverted to other purposes, sprang out of the missions of India, and was designed by these missions to rally the whole Christian Church to pray for the evangelization of the non-Christian world. Today I will venture to assert there are more foreign missionaries united in their prayer than any other class of Christians in the world.

In the fifth place, there have been achievements in actual unity which have far transcended anything that we have won as yet in any other areas of the Church's service. We see it in the united institutions. I could name scores of union colleges and theological seminaries and hospitals and institutions of every kind. The day has gone by when any separate communion undertakes any longer to build up alone a great educational institution of higher learning on the mission field. We have realized that there is nothing in truth that can be sectarian, that the great body of truth is common truth and that we should unite in undertaking higher educational work. In building a missionary university from two to ten different organizations will often unite. Further, all the medical missionaries in China have gathered in one medical association, and all the missionaries in educational work in one educational association. And we have gone far beyond this. One hears the question raised now and then as to whether our denominational personalities are ever

to be merged with others. It is being done all over the world to-day. There is scarcely a mission field where there is not an example of this. Denominations separate in the West are united in the East. In the East, in Japan, all the Episcopal Churches have united, likewise the Methodist, and more than thirty years ago all the Presbyterian and Reformed bodies, seven of them, still apart in the United States, united into one body. In China to-day the Presbyterian and the Reformed Churches are one, and the Congregationalists are uniting with them, no matter what nation they come from. All over the world we are witnessing the actual melting together of denominations. The missionaries are not afraid to put their ideals into words. Here is the resolution of the great Missionary Conference in Japan in 1900, adopted by the missionaries of all denominations gathered there: "This Conference of Missionaries, assembled in the city of Tokyo, proclaims its belief that all those who are one with Christ by faith are one body; and it calls upon all those who love the Lord Jesus and His Church in sincerity and truth to pray and to labor for the full realization of such a corporate oneness as the Master himself prayed for on that night in which He was betrayed." Here is the finding of the Centenary Conference in Shanghai: "That this Conference unanimously holds the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the supreme standard of faith and practice and holds firmly the primitive apostolic faith. Further, while acknowledging the Apostle's Creed and the Nicene Creed as substantially expressing the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, the Conference does not adopt any creed as a basis of Church unity, and leaves confessional questions for further consideration; yet, in view of our knowledge of each other's doctrinal symbols, history, work and character, we gladly recognize ourselves as already one body in Christ, teaching one way of eternal life, and calling

men into one holy fellowship; and as one in regard to the great body of doctrine of the Christian faith; one in our teaching as to the love of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; in our testimony as to sin and salvation, and our homage to the Divine and Holy Redeemer of men; one in our call to the purity of the Christian life, and in our witness to the splendors of the Christian hope.

“We frankly recognize that we differ as to methods of administration and Church government. But we unite in holding that these differences do not invalidate the assertion of our real unity in our common witness to the gospel of the grace of God.

“That in planting the Church of Christ on Chinese soil we desire only to plant one Church under the sole control of the Lord Jesus Christ, governed by the Word of the living God and led by His guiding Spirit. While freely communicating to this Church the knowledge of truth and the rich historical experience to which older churches have attained, we fully recognize the liberty in Christ of the Churches in China planted by means of the missions and Churches which we represent, in so far as these Churches are, by maturity of Christian character and experience, fitted to exercise it; and we desire to commit them in faith and hope to the continued safe keeping of their Lord when the time shall arrive, which we eagerly anticipate, when they shall pass beyond our guidance and control.”

I have now dealt with five regards in which the foreign mission work has gone in advance of us and has achieved already what we pray and long for here at home. And experience in the foreign mission field has taught us certain great and urgent lessons.

For one thing, it has shown us the possibility of co-operation and unity. We ask whether this thing can be done. It has been done far and wide throughout the mis-

sion field to-day. When we ask whether certain problems can be solved our answer is they have been solved and they have been solved under greater difficulties than we encounter here. Here in America we have the Presbyterian Church split into two over the issues that burst forth in the Civil War. We have not been able to reunite those two sections of the Presbyterian Church. There is not a single non-Christian land where we are at work together where they are not united. I do not see why if Northern and Southern Presbyterians can unite in the atmosphere of heathenism they can't unite in a Christian land. Not only have we been shown the possibility, we have been shown the duty. If it is our duty to draw together in the face of these problems that confront us in the foreign mission field, is there any less duty before the problems that confront us here in America? For where are the problems of the Christian Church more urgent than here in our own land? Every consideration that argues for unity in India or China argues for unity here in America. We have no small portion of the foreign mission problem to solve right here on this island, and if unity is essential to its solution ten thousand miles away unity is essential to its solution here.

And not only do foreign missions show us the possibility and duty of unity, but they remind us of the method. They show us for one thing the solidarity of a common task and a great danger. We used to think that the common task had a great cementing power. We realize now that there is nothing like a common danger to combine men together. We have got our common task still just as great as we had it four or five years ago. Only the shadow of Germany has gone by. And it is perfectly obvious that a common conviction cannot do what a common peril can. But we have still a common task and a common duty and a common peril. An idola-

trous world is not nearly so great a peril as a world that has thrown its ideals away and believes in no God at all. We are facing a vastly more perilous world than the old world of one hundred years ago, a pagan world, with its old evils and sicknesses, all its own economic problems of poverty and neglect, with our economic problems flung in upon them. Let anyone go out and listen to the whir of the spindles to-night in Osaka, let him go up and down those long rows of mills in Shanghai and hear the thunder of the great looms, and go in and look at the lives being fed into those spindles and woven in those looms, and he will realize that the world has far more perils and burdens to-day than it had in the old days gone by. We cannot divide in the face of a task like that or in the face of a peril so great.

And not only have we been shown how a great task and peril can unite, but our experience has revealed the power of fellowship in living to unite men in spite of their intellectual disagreement and their divergent temperaments. After all, one wonders whether we have diagnosed correctly the real causes of our continued separation. One wonders whether it is doctrine or faith that divides, or whether, after all, a great deal more of division does not spring from property and temperament, and that if only we could deal with property and temperament we could not take care of the questions of polity and creed. Human friendliness is a great unifier. Bishop Boone used to take all the newcomers in Shanghai into his home. There were times when many denominations of missionaries slept together under his roof.

And foreign missionaries have shown the method of unity which is to be found not in detailed comparison, but on the principle of transcendence, a larger principle than any that controls us now, that will enable us to see things in a conspectus in which we cannot see them now.

And not only are we to-day learning from foreign missions the method by which unity can be achieved, but we ought to learn and practice these lessons now. Shall not the horrors of the discord and the alienation and the disunity, out of which we have not yet emerged, make us ashamed of our divergence? The one great need of the world to-day is unity. The central principle of Christianity is unity. The fundamental element of all life is unity. How can we, in the Christian Church, obscure or qualify that principle by our diversions? We have learned the peril of conscientiousness. No man is justified in any course of action merely because he can conscientiously take it. Germany was just as conscientious as we. "The day will come," said our Lord, "when those who kill you will think that they do service unto God." Does conscientious murder make a man innocent? We have hidden behind our conscientiousness too long. We must beware of letting conscientiousness harden us to the risk of missing truth.

And to-day as never before unity is of such importance as to demand any necessary sacrifice, such sacrifices as men have never been willing to make before. And I set foremost among those sacrifices our false loyalty to the past. What is loyalty to the past? Loyalty to the past does not consist in trying to stay within it. Loyalty to the past consists in trying to rise above it. The past that did not prepare for a better future is an unfulfilled past. Truth that is truth opens the gates to larger truth. And those men are faithful to what lies behind them, who say to the past, "I see thy meaning. Thy meaning was that greater things were to be made possible by thee and I am loyal to thee only when I heed thy voice and go on to those greater and richer things." True loyalty does not consist in holding fast to an unchanged and unchangeable order that has been. It consists in standing faith-

fully upon the foundations that have been laid and opening ourselves to all the new light and truth and guidance which God is waiting to give to the Church if, like the path of the just, the Church is not a stagnant station, but a golden way that grows brighter and brighter to the fullness of the day that has not yet been, but that may yet be.

PRESENT POSSIBILITIES AND FUTURE STEPS TOWARDS UNITY

BY REV. T. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul at Kilburn.

THE time has come when in the interests of unity ambiguities should cease and we should approach the question with clearness of vision and a determination to go straight to the heart of the problem. The theological as distinct from the ecclesiastical aspect demands insistence upon the claim that history cannot be thrown to the winds. We are faced by earnest and honest assertions that the twentieth century will not accept a Christianity that holds the miraculous element essential to its profession. For my part I can conceive of men who have been nurtured in Christian principles and have a profound devotion to our Blessed Lord as the Son of God maintaining their faith while rejecting or explaining away the miraculous in the Gospel. What a few have been able to attain in the stress of modern conceptions of nature and an exaggerated attachment to current hypotheses is a very different matter from acceptance of the historic Figure who is portrayed in the Gospel story. In the web of His life, the warp of His deeds and the woof of His words are so bound up with miracle that we cannot disentangle the natural from the supernatural element—I use the words in their plain sense—and the whole faith of the primitive Church as well as the Church throughout the ages has been based on a living Christ who rose from the dead. We cannot divorce our faith from history. We are convinced that the sinless One was so unique among men that His deeds can only be described as miraculous, while really natural as being the works of One who was God incarnate, and it is impossible for us in the interests of unity without being false to the revelation of God and writing down the apostolic Church as founding itself on a series of lies, to make concessions that will re-

duce our faith to a series of propositions that cannot be squared with the contents of the only documents we have as the source of the life and teaching of the Son of God.

It may be that individuals will be ready to acknowledge His divinity while rejecting the fact of His resurrection from the dead. I do not exclude them from brotherhood—that is their own affair, not mine—but the basis of belief that will form the foundation of the great Church the future will see united in one by bonds of spirit and a common orientation of faith, must hold the ultimate fact of the resurrection if it is not to perish through lack of faithfulness to its sources and belief in its history. Mithraism was the great rival of Christianity. It had its ennobling ideals and gripped some of the best minds of the early Christian ages. It broke down through an idealism divorced from fact—historic fact—and the doom, not the reconstruction, of Christianity will be pronounced by any acceptance of a creedless Christianity or a studied vagueness that is supposed to meet the requirements of a kaleidoscopic age. Creeds do not give spiritual life. They do not even guarantee moral consistency. A man may be as orthodox as the devil and as wicked too. But Christian truth is a matter of the intellect as well as an emotion of the heart. We must know what we believe concerning Him who is our life. That knowledge is contained in the New Testament, and the evacuation of its plain meaning can only end in the overthrow in time of the faith we profess to hold.

On the other hand the institution that the faith has created as a permanent home for its followers is of less importance than the faith itself. Just as intellectual definitions are inferior to the person of Christ, so the human instrumentality that constitutes the home of the faithful is inferior to the Christ Himself. The Church to be true to its function is a body founded on Christ that grows up into Christ its living Head. It is a means to an end—not

an end in itself. If this be true concerning the Church, it is still more true concerning its organisation. Membership of the Church, for its vitality depends finally on no outward link uniting individuals with the body, but on personal living union with the Saviour Himself. Spiritual life is as great a reality as animal life. We are aware that we are alive as men. We must be equally alive to the fact that our spiritual life is a reality depending on our sharing the life of Christ. The way in which this knowledge comes into consciousness may elude definition—it is there when the soul of man rises above the temporal and homes itself in God. All who truly love and follow the risen Christ are true sons of God—joint heirs with Jesus Christ. Collectively they constitute the Church of the living God, and all the organisation of the Church is a means for maintaining corporate life in an historical institution, and preventing it from becoming inefficacious as an instrument for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

Today we suffer from either an unstudied or a deliberate ambiguity in the use of the words Church, ministry and apostolic succession. I am not sure that we have not created a new ambiguity in the employment of the phrase historic episcopate. Until we have a definite and accepted interpretation of these phrases all thoughts of Christian unity with any hope of permanence may be dismissed as a fatuous dream. We have schemes discussed that imply the Church of God to be definitely limited to an institution that has a certain type of ministry—commonly called the Church—with an impassable gulf between it and the laity. The ministry is confined to men ordained by one of the orders of the ministry, and that order has its claim to superiority resting on a supposed historical transmission from age to age by a certain process of setting apart men for the ministry. All who wish for unity must either now or in the future submit to that

ideal, and we are told that unless those who submit to ordination acknowledge by their action the theory involved as true there is no room for them in the Church. That ideal is in no sense the ideal found in the New Testament or in primitive Christianity. The upholders of this theory have to face the awkward fact that in Egypt to the middle of the second century nothing was known of the alleged necessity of episcopal ordination for a valid exercise of the ministry. Today it is forced on us by the experience of our home work and the triumphs of the mission field that the non-episcopal ministries and work are as richly blessed as those of episcopal Churches, and it is only a purblind logic that asserts we find ministries of grace valid for the members of the non-episcopalian Churches, and not valid for those who are privileged to be members of episcopal Churches. If the real test of churchmanship be living union with the head of the Church, then the fact that a ministry is truly a ministry of grace involves that all who are brought under its influence and are participators of its worship—whether they be Episcopalians or non-Episcopalians—are in the way of receiving grace. The implication that a type of ministry honoured by God should be dishonoured by men, who in agreement with a supposed Christian principle abstain from participating in its sacraments, means that man sits in judgment and pronounces an adverse verdict on the work of God.

The sooner, therefore, we free ourselves of any superiority on account of our historical position as specially privileged recipients of the grace of God, the better for our Christian life. I cannot for one moment write down as spiritually inferior, or as organically spurious, the great non-episcopal Churches whose numbers far exceed those of the Church of England, and whose work has been signally honoured by God. I hold as firmly as any man the fact that until the unity of the Church was broken

by the sins and failures of episcopal Christianity, episcopacy was the prevailing form of Church government for more than a millennium—but it was not a millennium of healthy, spiritual development and moral progress, or justifiable institutional growth. The fifteenth century, with its united Western Church, is not a model to be aimed at by those who wish to follow the King and do His will. The verdict of the Council of Trent is sufficient proof of that. We must aim at a flock with many folds, not a Church with a number of orders whose present state is in complete contrast with the spirit that gave rise to their existence. They may be, as they have been, institutionalised out of all relation to their aims and ideals.

In practice we must be prepared to admit the full validity for all Christendom of the orders of men who are set apart for the ministry by the great non-episcopal Churches. Re-ordination will confer no new grace—will not regularise in the sight of God their ministry, although it may regularise it from the standpoint of individual communities—folds of the one flock. There is absolutely no hope or prospect of the non-episcopal Churches accepting re-ordination as a gift from God necessary for increased validity or Church catholic regularity of their ministry. They know this, and while willing to accept the overseership of bishops, they are not ready to accept the theory attached to episcopacy without which episcopacy is meaningless in the opinion of those who insist on the Church acting as if their view of episcopacy is the only possible one. The day will come when that theory will be frankly abandoned, after undergoing many transformations in the desperation of its upholders to defend it in the light of modern knowledge. That day is not yet, and until it comes we must maintain our strong protest against the claims put forward in its support.

We have come to see that until the Table of the Lord is acknowledged to be the Table round which all His follow-

ers, irrespective of their denominationalism, may freely gather, we cannot talk of Christian unity. Anything short of this is a caricature of the Spirit of Christ. When the fruits of a godly life and the profession of a living faith in the Saviour are vouched for by a responsible Christian community, there is something almost blasphemous in man saying, "The gift of the holy sacrament is not for you—it is only for those who accept it as exclusively theirs on whom episcopal hands have been laid." Surely such a doctrine and practice is nothing but a sin against the whole teaching of Him who said "do this in remembrance of Me!" If baptism can be administered by a layman, why should the Lord's Table be confined to those who have received episcopal confirmation, to those who have either been confirmed directly as in England, confirmed in bulk as in some continental countries, confirmed by a priest in infancy with the chrism consecrated by a priest? There is something repulsively magical in the contention that will admit the indirectly confirmed by the bishop with the oil he has blessed, and will exclude men whose life and work are honoured by God and His Church.

The principle laid down will involve our not refusing to communicate at the Lord's Table when the consecration has been the act of a non-episcopally ordained man full of the Holy Ghost and of faith. To do this is not reason to our Church, which is one of many folds. Brotherliness demands it when occasion arises, and abstention from so doing partakes of Pharisaism when we look upon the position with the eyes of the New Testament saints. The Table of the Lord gives the great opportunity for showing our brotherhood. That opportunity must be reciprocal if it is to be in any sense real.

The hour has arrived for a step forward, and it is only in accord with the findings of the past for us to declare that no ministry of grace blessed by God is not in accord

with His will, that no ministry has any inherent superiority in His sight over other ministries of a different institutional type, that unity is not the child of a uniform Church government, and that the Table of the Lord is the place where the spirit of unity must be shown before any real federated institutional unity in one great Church with many folds and many forms of government faces the world that has to be won to God.

PAUL'S PLAN FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. JOHN B. COWDEN, Nashville, Tenn.

A STUDY of Paul's plan for Christian unity should be prefaced by a study of his teaching on Christian liberty and loyalty, because the three are closely associated and interdependent upon each other. A correct understanding and application of the loyalty and liberty of Christian worship is, therefore, essential to the unity of the same. These three must be studied and kept together, otherwise their Scriptural use and meaning will be missed. The Catholic Church has unity without liberty, and the Protestant Church has liberty without unity; but the apostolic Church had unity with liberty, which is Christian unity. Unity and liberty were inseparably connected in the New Testament Church, and the connecting link between the two was loyalty. Liberty, loyalty and unity constitute the Scriptural trinity, the three in one, of the New Testament Church; or, in other words, Christian unity can not be without the broadest liberty that loyalty will permit; nor is any one of the three truly Christian without the other two. However, whenever it is necessary to choose between the three, loyalty to Christ must be always placed before unity and liberty. Paul often had to choose between liberty and loyalty, and he always chose the latter. Luther was offered unity without liberty within the Catholic Church at the sacrifice of loyalty; and he chose the latter by nailing up his theses and burning the Papal decree at the gates of Wittenberg, thereby laying the foundation of his great Reformation upon loyalty and liberty; however, in doing so, liberty was over-emphasized and unity was lost. The over-emphasis of liberty soon led to divisions, which have continued to multiply from that day to this. Luther solved the problem of loyalty and liberty, but was unable to solve the problem of unity, which has come down to us an unsolved problem.

This does not mean, however, that it can not be solved. In fact, we ought to be more able and in a better position to solve this problem than were our forefathers; otherwise Christian progress and development mean nothing. Christ evidently thought that all his followers could and would worship together sometime, for He prayed that "they may all be one," and stated, "They shall become one flock, one shepherd." So, then, the unity of Christian worshipers is not a dream of the millennium or some religious Utopia, but a possible and probable state, for which Christ prayed and Paul worked, and which actually existed for several hundred years in the apostolic Church. However, it must be frankly admitted that we are still far from the final solution of this problem. Divisions and sectarianism are still abroad in the land, with all their attendant evils; and the Church of Christ has been rent asunder with strife and contention into many warring sects and parties, until today there are nearly two hundred separate religious bodies in the Christian world.

However, the pendulum has begun to swing back toward unity. The Churches have at last realized the evils of division, and are seeking the way to unity. The denominations, which a few years ago were the pride and glory of Christians, have few apologists today, while many eloquent tongues and pens in every denomination are pleading for unity with all God's people, and the whole Church seems to be possessed with a passion to return to "the one fold and one shepherd." This widespread desire for unity has found its way even into the seclusive and exclusive Roman Church, which for centuries has dwelt behind its high "walls of partition"; but today there has arisen the Modernist Movement in the Catholic Church, that seems to be trying to find its way into the great common fold of Christ. Of this movement Abbe Houtin says: "O sons and heritors of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, you see beginning in the

Church of Rome, which condemned your fathers without listening to them—you see beginning a religious struggle more far-reaching than that of Luther and Calvin.” The Roman Catholic scholar, Mehler, a Modernist, says: “Both communions [Protestant and Catholic] should stretch out a friendly hand to one another in the consciousness of a common guilt. This open confession of guilt on both sides will be followed by the festival of reconciliation.” And Father Tyrrell adds: “In the light of these centuries of necessary but costly experience, may not the problem of liberty and authority now admit of some happier solution, and on the ruins of two opposing systems be built up something more durable than either?” On the other hand, the advocates of Christian unity in the Protestant Churches are too numerous to quote or mention. The desire for Christian unity is so far spread today that it is hardly worth while to spend time in showing that unity is the desirable thing. This has been the chief objective of the preaching and writing on Christian unity in the past; but this is very largely, if not altogether, conceded today. Whatever was lacking to convince all of the desirableness of Christian unity has been supplied by the great World War, which clearly demonstrated both the weakness and sinfulness of divisions, and the strength and efficiency of unity. This almost unanimous desire for unity is the first pre-essential to Christian unity, because the desire is the father of the deed. Only people that greatly desire to unite can unite.

In fact, the prevailing feeling today toward unity is more than a desire; it is a necessity. In view of the greatness and the urgency of the world's need today, and the greatness of the task to supply this need, the Church must unite, or fail in its mission to the world. The supplying of the world's temporal and spiritual needs today is too big a task for a divided Church, just as it was too big a task during the great World War. When that

great, world-wide conflagration of suffering and death broke out in the world, men and women turned to the Church saying: "Where is the Church? Can not the Church prevent this awful war?" And some began to ask: "Has the Church failed?" Yes, the Church did fail—failed because of its division. A united Church could doubtless have prevented this war. Furthermore, as the war progressed, with its awful suffering and untold deaths, suffering and dying humanity again turned to the Church, saying: "Can't you feed us? Can't you bind up our wounds? Can't you pour in the oil of consolation and salvation in the hour of our death?" And again, on account of division, the Church had to sit helpless and unable to respond to this world call, while such institutions as the Y. M. C. A., the Red Cross, the Knights of Columbus, the Salvation Army, etc., did this work that the Church of Christ was organized to do. If there have ever been tears shed in heaven, undoubtedly they were shed then, when Jesus Christ looked down upon this starving, bleeding, dying world crying for help, and His Church, weakened and incapacitated through division, unable to respond to these needs. But you say: "The above institutions that did this work are Christian institutions." That is true; but they are not the Church, and the Church as an institution had to sit idly by, while the world suffered and died, because it was too big a task for a divided Church. While the war has passed, the need for a united Church is no less now than during the war, because the Church today is confronted by other world tasks and problems that are too big for a divided Church. The war brought the nations of the earth together in a common cause, and bound their welfare and destiny together in such a way that the world today is one, and the tasks and problems that confront us today are world problems and tasks. National seclusiveness is a thing of the past. Nothing short of a united League of Nations can meet

and solve the governmental problems and tasks of the future, and nothing short of a united Church can meet and solve the religious problems and tasks of the future. Wherefore, the time has come when the Churches must unite. It is not a time to preach Christian unity, but to practice it.

But is Christian unity possible? Surely Christ would not have prayed for an impossibility, nor would He have declared, "There shall be one fold and one shepherd," if such were impossible; and Paul declares: "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me." What people can do depends largely on the impelling motive behind the deed. With a sufficient motive, Christian unity is not only possible, but highly probable. The strongest motive power of which men and women are capable, says Paul, is love, which he sets forth as the only influence sufficient to effect and maintain Christian unity. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Even as it is written,

For thy sake we are killed all the day long;
We are counted as sheep for the slaughter.

Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Paul asks the question, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" and then answers it by affirming that absolutely nothing can break this tie in Christ. He mentions some of the greatest alienating causes, such as tribulation, anguish, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril and sword, so, if none of these terrible experiences can alienate us from Christ, then there is

nothing that can. We, therefore, have a tie in Christ that binds in spite of all the alienating causes.

Note, furthermore, that this tie not only binds, but it triumphs. "We are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." We are victorious in spite of all difficulties that may arise in life or death, from principalities and powers in high places or low, or from any creature whatsoever. We, therefore, have a tie in Christ Jesus our Lord that binds and triumphs in spite of all the alienating causes and defeating difficulties that beset the pilgrimage of Christian life.

Love is the only motive power that can bind and triumph over all opposition in this life. There are other motive powers that can bind and triumph for awhile. For instance, hatred, the opposite of love, can bind people together for awhile, and lead them to victory over some difficulties, as it did in the case of the enemies of Christ, who were bound together by a common hatred, and were led by the same to the victory of His death; but they did not remain together long, but soon parted, and the cause of Christ triumphed over them. Hope also is a strong motive power in one's life, and those that are led on by the bright star of hope accomplish great victories; but hope is not invincible. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick"—is easily discouraged and gives up the fight. Also, the human will is a great motive power, so great that there are few limitations on what those that say, "I can and will," can do; but even the human will is not invincible. Mr. Henley was mistaken when he said: "I thank God for my unconquerable soul." The human soul is not invincible. There are roads too rough and mountains too high to be traveled and scaled by the human will; and there are burdens too heavy to be borne by the human will; such burdens as poor, frail, delicate women are carrying to-day—loads that would crush the will of the strongest man in the world. The only reason

that any one can carry such a burden is that love is underneath the load. Love can carry any burden, and endure any hardship. In other words, love alone is invincible; and this is what Paul meant when he said: "We are more than conquerors through Him that loved us."

But has not Paul in his zeal overstated the power of love? Not so, when we take into consideration Paul's conception of love. Love, to Paul, is the vital, central motive power that controls and regulates the whole social and spiritual world. Love is to the spiritual universe what the force of gravity is to the physical universe. When God created the universe, He created and set in operation the law of gravity that was to control and regulate everything in the universe; and through the operation of this great law of matter everything is held in position, and moves on in such perfect unison and harmony that, listening, you can almost hear the music of the spheres. However, there come times—times of storm—when it seems that the world is about to go to pieces; but you know that down beneath the storm is a mightier power than the storm, the power of gravity, which you can trust to hold the world together; and so it has been with all the storms that have assailed the earth. The storm in all its fury passed; and, with the exception of a rent here and a gash there, the old world was left the same. Just so there come storms in the social and spiritual world that threaten and disturb the safety and peace of the world for the time, and at times it looks as if everything is going to pieces. Especially was this the case in the last war, which was the greatest social storm that this world has ever seen; but we have seen it pass, and the old world is left largely the same as it was. God is still at the center of things, and His love, a great attractive force, permeates the whole social universe, and holds things together, and will continue to do so even to the end. Wherefore Paul says, "We are more

than conquerors through Him that loved us;" which is no exaggerated statement of the power of love, but the simple truth that underlies the whole social and spiritual world; and through this love as the motive power, and through it alone, Christians can and will unite.

Yes, they can unite, but will they? In view of their great differences and strong feelings, will they be willing to lay these aside and let love have its way? If they have the love of which Paul speaks above, they will, and it matters not how great the differences and how bitter the feelings. One illustration will suffice to show this. A husband and wife became alienated, and separated; a third party undertook to reunite them. He talked to the man first, and he thought that he never heard a man say uglier, meaner things about any woman than the husband said about his wife. He talked with the wife next, and then he decided that the man had not said anything about his wife. Well, he concluded, of course, that it was useless to try further to get these people together. They were too far apart, and their feelings toward each other were too bitter and intense. But they were united, and how? They had a little child; and this little child came over to the father, and, taking him by the hand, led him over to the mother; and they fell on each other's necks, and wept, and were united again. They had a common love; they both loved that little child; and this common love brought them together and kept them together. Christians have a common love; they all love Jesus Christ; and Paul says that this tie binds in spite of all alienating causes and difficulties. If Christians would only let Christ bring them together, where they could see the nail-prints in His hands and the sword-thrust in His side, they could, and would come together and unite. "Nothing," says Paul, "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Note, next, to what this tie unites us. In the first place, it unites us to God; and what a blessed thing it is to be united to God! In the second place, it unites us to each other. Paul says that nothing shall be able to separate "*us*," not *me*, from the love of God. The Christian tie is not an individual tie, but a fraternal tie. It is a tie that binds Christians together, and thus united they are united to God. No Christian can separate himself from his brethren, and claim an individual tie with God. "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, can not love God whom he hath not seen." Love is the only influence in the world that can bring people together and keep them together. Love is the only tie that can keep a home together, and it is the only tie that can keep a Church together. Many Christians have trusted a common faith to keep them together. They believed the same things, and they trusted this tie to keep them together in the bond of peace; but it failed. A common faith, however strong, can not maintain the bond of Christian brotherhood. Only a common love can do this. The strong heat of a fervent common love is the only influence that can melt and unite human hearts in a lasting bond of Christian unity; but this can, and will, unite all Christians that allow the love of God to have its way in their hearts and over their lives.

But love is not the only essential to Christian unity, as some seem to think. Love only makes unity possible or probable. It is the only possible approach to unity, and the only probable way of realizing the same; yet love alone can not unite the Christian world. Love is the only impelling motive that can surmount all difficulties in the way of unity, but the way to unity must be made practical. Love alone is not practical, but rather visionary, so love alone can not be trusted to lead the way to unity. In addition to love, Paul says there must be "faith working through love;" and through this

working combination all Christian problems can be solved. "Faith is assurance and conviction;" or, in other words, faith rests upon evidence, and follows the light of reason, and is, therefore, practical in its leadings and conclusions. So, then, we look to faith for the practical side of unity. Any unity that does not fulfill the requirements of faith can not be a practical or a lasting unity; and, furthermore, it must satisfy the requirements of a Scriptural faith, otherwise it would not be Scriptural unity. Scriptural faith is "faith that cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Wherefore, we look to the word of God for the practical realization of Christian unity.

Before Christian unity can be made practical, a practical plan, by which, and upon which, all Christians can unite, must be found. This seems to be the one thing lacking to-day to make unity practicable. In answer to this demand for a practical plan for Christian unity, four plans have so far been offered. The Roman Catholic Church proposes a return to the mother Church, where, they claim, there was unity until Luther and other reformers broke it up. This plan would undoubtedly secure unity, but it would do so at the price of two things in the world that are worth more than unity; namely, loyalty and liberty, without which, as we have shown, it would not be Christian unity; and besides, such a unity would not satisfy the requirements of Scriptural faith, and could not, therefore, be Scriptural unity. The Episcopalians also have a plan to bring the Christian world together. The Protestant Episcopal Church has always claimed to be a sort of half-way house between Catholicism and Protestantism, and has hoped to bring Rome down and Geneva up to this common level; and to this end this communion offers what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral as a practical plan for Christian unity. But one of the items in this plan is the historic

bishopric, or apostolic succession, which excludes its acceptance by all congregational or democratic communions. The Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists propose a federation of all the Churches, which, of course, is not unity at all, and, for this reason, has not been seriously considered by the Churches. Another plan, first proposed by the Campbells and advocated to the present by those committed to this plan, is a restoration of the apostolic Church and unity upon the same. But there have arisen differences as to what the apostolic Church was in all respects, and some doubt the propriety of restoring the apostolic Church in some respects, so this plan has so far failed to unite the Churches. There is good in all the above plans, but all of them have so far failed to restore the unity of the Church; however, they have taught us some very important negative lessons.

In the first place, the failure of the above plans has taught us that Christian unity can not be an ecclesiasticism, where one man or a number of men constitute the head of the Church; that has always been religious tyranny and spiritual despotism. Not a union of denominations, where one denomination swallows up all the others; that would be a denominational monster, or monstrosity. Not a federation of sects, where each sect is fitted into its allotted niche and place, and agrees to occupy as little space as possible; that would be stagnation and death. Not an aggregation of unreconciled sects, where each has signed an armistice; that has always resulted in renewed hostilities. Not a peace by compromise, where all agree to maintain a respectful silence such as the tombs of a graveyard; that would be a living death. Not a bargain, where one thing is given up by one, and another thing is given up in return by another; that would be selling out. Not a forced union, where all speak the same thing through slavish fear; that would be

a new edition of "The Book of Martyrs." Not a uniformity of opinions, where each one sneezes when the other takes snuff; that would be religious hypocrisy. Not a union of all the theories and philosophies of the religious thinkers and dreamers of the past; that would be a religious museum. Not a union of all the modern cults and isms; that would be fanaticism, of which the world is full already. Not a union in theory or name only, but a real, practical, organic union of the dismembered parts of the divided body of Christ; and that which is needed most to effect such a union is a practical, acceptable plan.

In view of the failure of the above plans, which were wrought out of the best thought and experience of the past, and in view of the fact that the Churches of to-day have no other to offer, where shall we look for a better plan? When we have exhausted all human resources of the past and the present, where do we usually look for help? "My help cometh from Jehovah, who made heaven and earth." Yes, but God has not given us any help at this point; He has left us in the darkness to find our own way out of the confusion of division into the light of unity. If this be true, Christian unity is indeed a hopeless undertaking. However, is it not strange that Christ would have prayed for the unity of all His disciples, and commanded them to work for the same, without giving them some plan and basis for unity? Furthermore, if "the scriptures furnish us completely unto every good work," as Paul says they do, is it not strange that they do not give us a practical working plan for Christian unity, the greatest of good works? Before we conclude that there is no Scriptural plan for Christian unity, let us search the Scriptures for light on this point.

We find in Paul's letter to the Ephesians a plan outlined, which united the religious sects of that day, both Jews and Gentiles, who hated each other with all the animosity and bitterness of which the soul is capable.

The religious sects of to-day are no further apart, and have no greater hatred for each other, than they had in Paul's day, so a plan that united the sects of that day can, we believe, do the same to-day. This plan is as follows:

“For He [Christ] is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that He might create in Himself of the two one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and he came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh: for through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father. So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in Whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit” (Eph. 2:14-22).

By analytical study of the above plan, outlined by Paul, it will be found to contain seven basic items or fundamental principles (a heptagon instead of a quadrilateral), which constituted the plan and basis for unity in Paul's day, and which, we believe, is sufficient for unity to-day:

(1) A common standard of authority. “*For He (Christ) is our peace, Who made both (Jews and Gentiles) one.*” (2) The removal of differences. “*And brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that He might create in Himself of the two one new man, so making peace.*” (3) Reconciliation. “*And might reconcile them both in one body unto Christ through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.*” (4) A common access unto the Father. “*Through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.*” (5) A democratic brotherhood. “*So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.*” (6) The foundation of unity. “*Being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ*

Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone.” (7) The units of union. *“In Whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in Whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.”*

This is Paul's plan, so let no individual or denomination make claim to the same, but let all accept it, and unite by it. It is the only undenominational plan, because it was formed centuries before any of the modern denominations existed, so it has no denominational bias or sectarian associations to prejudice any one against it. It is also the only Scriptural plan, because all that is claimed for other plans is that they are only deductions from the Scriptures, while every step or item in the above plan was expressly prescribed verbatim by the divinely inspired apostle Paul. While we have analyzed and commented on the several items or steps in this plan, we were careful to add to or take nothing from it. The comments are ours; the plan is Paul's. Furthermore, it is the only truly catholic plan, the only plan that all can accept. It contains nothing more nor less than the final essential deposit of Christianity, as conceived and stated by Paul, the master builder of Christianity. No other plan offers a programme that appeals to all communions. It is also the only practical plan, because no other plan has succeeded in uniting a divided Church, while it successfully united all the sects of Paul's day, and maintained unity in the Church for several hundred years; and it will do the same to-day, if it is only given a fair trial. Unity by this plan, of course, would be a drastic and far-reaching step on the part of the Churches to-day—one that involves many denominational sacrifices. This is what makes all hesitate and draw back from such a union. To be sure, only by the sacrifice of everything sectarian and denominational, can Christian unity be realized, because unity, purchased at any less

price, would be only a continuation, more or less, of sectarianism. Lastly, Paul's plan is the only perfect plan, lacking nothing necessary to unite the whole Christian world, except to be accepted and tried.

Yes, but will this ever be? If the signs of the times and the words of many of the religious leaders are to be believed, such a union can and will be realized. There are evidences on all hands of an increasing acceptance of Paul's plan, or the New Testament basis for Christian unity, as the following quotations from leaders to-day clearly show:

"We must go back to essential New Testament principles, for their ancient programme, re-emphasized in the largest way, is the conquering programme of the future."—*Rev. Oliver Huckel, D.D. (Congregationalist), Baltimore, Md.*

"The only solid basis of Church union is the general abandonment of doctrines, traditions, theories and rites not found in the New Testament. So long as Christians cling to the traditions of the later fathers, and refuse to go back to the plain teachings and simple ordinances of the New Testament, there will be irreconcilable divisions in the body of Christ. The true basis of the union of Christendom, for which so many to-day are longing, is a general return to primitive Christianity. It is not difficult to determine what that is, for it is writ large on the pages of the Book. Let us all cheerfully give up every dogma, every ceremonial, not found there, and Christian and Church union will come of itself. Any attempt at union on a lower plane will prove a failure."—*Examiner (Baptist).*

"All things are calling us just now to give ourselves and our Church to primary things, and to keep out of the way all secondary things, however good and true, however much we prize them. It is time to rally to the defence of our common Christianity, and let our private, partisan and denominational peculiarities shift for themselves. If they die, so much gain for the kingdom of God."—*Dr. Wm. P. Merrill (Presbyterian).*

"We, the representatives of the Presbyterian, the Methodist and the Congregational branches of the Church of Christ in Canada, do hereby set forth the substance of the Christian faith as commonly held among us. In doing so we build upon the foundation laid by the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."—*From "The Published Basis of Union."*

"There is a necessity of a return to first principles; we must get behind the prejudices, interests, errors and associations of history to the fountain-head of Christianity; we must sit at the feet of the Master, and move again in the company of the apostles. We must become in temper and in spirit, and not merely in name and in claim, an apostolic Church."—*Canon Hensley Henson (Episcopalian).*

"The Church that we need is a Church that stands for the simplicity and the sufficiency of the religion of Jesus Christ, calling itself by no name but one. The best men in all the Churches are seeking to a common basis of union, to come together on some large Christian confession, and to live with one another as becomes disciples of Christ."—*Dr. John Hunter, of Trinity Church, Glasgow, Scotland.*

"We do hereby affirm that Christian unity, now so earnestly desired by

the memorialists, can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided catholic Church during the first ages of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by His apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and, therefore, incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards for the common and equal benefit of all men.”—*The Bishops of the Episcopal Church to the Whole Church*.

“We want a Christianity more pure, more practical, more conformed to the original Gospel.”—*Catholic Modernist*.

From the above statements it is clear that there is a decided leaning in all the Churches toward Paul’s plan for Christian unity, which is indicative of the coming of this union. In fact, it is already being realized in a large degree on the foreign field, as is seen from the following from J. Campbell Gibson, Presbyterian missionary in China: “When we met in Shanghai two years ago, the representatives of over fifty missions of the Western Churches, we found ourselves able to declare cordially that we are one body in Christ, and we assured the Chinese Church that we desire only to plant one Church under the sole control of the Lord Jesus Christ, governed by the word of the living God and led by His guiding Spirit. When you speak the words of division, your voice is the voice of strangers; and the flock of Christ will neither hear nor follow.” He who said, “Christian unity will proceed from the circumference to the center,” seems to have been a true prophet. Christian unity can be fully realized everywhere, both at the center and on the circumference and throughout the whole of Christendom, if only Paul’s plan for unity is accepted and followed. While this plan for unity and the vision of a united Church come to us out of the distant past, yet it is not a passing dream of the dark, closing night, but a sure promise of the red, opening dawn; and, if all the signs of Christian unity on the horizon of the future are to be believed, the glad day of the unity of all God’s people in the Church of His Son, when all shall bow down and worship Him together, is not far distant; and we pray God that it may speedily come.

SOME FALLACIES CONCERNING CHURCH UNION AND A HOPEFUL PLAN

BY REV. ROBERT WESTLY PEACH, D.D., RECTOR EMANUEL REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH, NEWARK, N. J.

THE unity of Christ's people for which He prayed is indisputably a spiritual unity. He compares it with His own unity with the Father: "That they may be one, even as we are one" (v. 22). It is the communion of those who avow Him as their Saviour, obey Him as their Lord, because they believe in His coessential deity with the Father.

This spiritual unity has not yet been attained by the whole body of people who call themselves by His Name. Even after eliminating those who are not sincere, there remain those who deny His deity, and those who in their thought destroy it by division in deifying His mother. Throughout the centuries, a partial fulfilment of His prayer has been granted. For the sum total of all true believers in Him as Saviour, Lord, and God, we have an ancient and honored title: "The Holy Catholic Church." This is a Church invisible, a spirit disembodied. Is it the only possible unity of His people on this sphere, or in this dispensation? Is it, with its progressive enlargement, the nearest possible fulfilment of the Saviour's prayer?

Those who believe that it is, and who advance arguments against every movement to bring together at least and at first some of the scattered branches of the visible Church, and equally some of those who believe in a visible unity and set forth arguments in favor of a oneness of order or of modes, make some contentions which are clearly fallacious. It is the purpose of this article to deal with a few of these fallacies.

(1) *The Spiritual Fallacy*.—This is the argument that because the unity for which Christ prayed is spiritual, therefore a visible embodiment of this unity would be

contrary to His wish. That is, man being a spirit, his entempling in the flesh is contrary to the creative purpose; that is, the Son of God, equally with the Father and the Father and the Holy Ghost, being a spirit, His incarnation was a violation of the divine will. Nay rather, as St. Paul voices the universal desire, even now and all the more after the decay of this earthly body we have and shall have the "longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven" (2 Cor. v. 2); and he adds to this the assurance of God's sanction (v. 5). And as to the Christ, St. Paul says, "He Who was manifested in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16), and St. Peter adds, "was manifested at the end of the times for your sake" (1 Pet. 1:20). For man's sake, yea also, for Christ's sake, that is, for His glory, a body for the spiritual unity of His people is worthily to be longed for.

And now, leaving the first century for the twentieth, let us consider some of the current erroneous arguments.

(2) *The Egotistical Fallacy*.—This is the argument that the union of one's Church, or one's branch of the Church, with another or others would be a lowering of its standard. They have not so valid and historic a ministry; or so close fidelity to the Scriptures; or so great missionary zeal and beneficence; or such a venerable and beautiful liturgy, if any; or such evangelistic enthusiasm; or such a necrology of great names; or such a roster of living leaders of eminence; or educational standards so high; or comparable religious statesmanship; or what not? The *argumentum ad hominem* is the reply: "by their fruits ye shall know them." The devotional classics, the great hymns, the noblest sermons, the famous commentaries, of our literature were produced by the ministers and members of no one Church but of many. Heroic missionaries, Pentecostal evangelists, self-sacrificing pastors, have not emerged preponderatingly from

any one denomination but from many. The saintliest lives in any community will not be found confined to any one of its Churches, and in the country at large they will surely be found proportionately dispersed throughout all the communions. The genius of every denomination has wrought out some distinguishing merits and developed some structural weaknesses. A union of two or more of these bodies would uncover their several defects for remedy and bring into relief their several elements of strength for development.

(3) *The Homogeneal Fallacy*.—This argues the fear that combination of branches of the Church would destroy the homogeneity now characterizing any one of them. The argument is premised upon a condition non-existent. In a single denomination are found evangelicals, sacramentalists and rationalists; Calvinists and Arminians; premillenarians and postmillennialists; open- and close-communion advocates; believers in the verbal inspiration of the Bible and higher critics; and, for an extreme example, believers that foot-washing is an ordinance, who differ as to whether one or both feet should be washed therein. Without contradiction, the fallacy is exposed by a fact precisely the opposite; there is an outstanding and far more characteristic homogeneity now appearing in the worship, the preaching and the work-methods of the divided Churches; so that given a non-liturgical Church, the visitor who does not know its name will not be able to tell from the service, and even ordinarily from the sermon, whether he is worshiping in a Methodist or a Baptist or a Presbyterian or a Disciples' or a Congregational or a Reformed or a United Brethren, or some other sanctuary.

(4) *The Regimental Fallacy*.—How often we have heard it declared, each time with an air implying an original figure of speech, "We are all regiments of the

one great army." Let us follow that figure in an illustration: Two national guard regiments are ordered out on a practise march and encampment. The colonel of one locates a field as the sun is westering and commands the regiment to halt and fix camp. As the work nears completion the other regiment approaches from the opposite direction, and its colonel commands it to halt and fix camp on the same spot, his men to run a row of tents down the middle of each company street and beyond, and to erect a mess-tent on the site selected by the first for a drill-ground. The results can easily be imagined. Yet this is precisely what our Churches of different denominations have long been doing. New parishes crowd into fields already fully occupied, either to succeed by robbing the older parishes or to fail with complete loss of all labor and money spent. The Interchurch World Movement survey of Southern Ohio has revealed many settlements in which such overcrowding has resulted in practically killing all the Churches in such communities, so that there is not left a single resident minister or a single Church with regular weekly services. Of course the illegitimacy-rate and the death-rate in these places have been found abnormally high. Regiments of the same army do not fight each other to depletion or mutual extinction.

(5) *The Numerical Fallacy.*—This argument runs thus: Denominationalism has not resulted in over-churching, save in exceptional places; there are plenty of people to fill the churches if only pastors and people would go out after them; empty pews are not found in churches where men of ability and unfeigned piety preach with freshness of presentation and with unction the blessed old truths of the Gospel. By way of illustration some exceptional cases of a crowded church where the latter conditions are fulfilled are cited. By way of

refutation multiple cases of half-empty churches where the same conditions are fulfilled may be adduced. The implicit charge in the statement is a cruel misjudgment and a slander. Devout men of learning and eloquence and fidelity to the Son of God Whom they proclaim, filled with love for their fellow men, are preaching in all denominations all over our country to small and gradually diminishing congregations. And why? because there are not available people enough to fill their churches by half. Based upon figures drawn from the religious census of the United States of America for the years 1906 and 1916, if on a given day by edict all people could be ordered to abandon work at a given hour and assemble in the houses of worship of their choice, and if the order were obeyed, the synagogues and the Roman churches would be filled to suffocation and the streets in front crowded from curb to curb; while the Protestant churches, supposing that the ill were borne on stretchers and the infants in arms, would still not be filled. It may be added that the 1920 estimate by the Federal Council of Churches of the entire Protestant population of our country falls short by three millions of the 1906 census estimates of the seating capacity of six-sevenths of the Protestant churches!

(6) *The Ordinal Fallacy*.—Here is an adjective forced into an unusual meaning, because there is no other adjective that will serve. The fallacy so described is not used by opponents of organic union but by advocates who can see no possibility of such union without uniformity of ordination of all ministers by successors of the Apostles of Christ. Eschewing all controversy, it will suffice simply to state that the great majority of Protestant ministers believe that there is no Scriptural warrant or historical proof of the doctrine that there is anywhere in the world a line of tactual succession from the Apos-

tles, down which apostolic authority has been transmitted. A fundamental of unity must be respect of the standing of communicants of the uniting Churches and of their ministers. Either re-confession or re-ordination as a condition would block any movement toward union,—as would, to take another case, re-baptism of those who had not been immersed. The fallacy lies in overlooking the fact that the true unity is that of the spirit, and that the visible expression of that true unity may be attained by agreement of the divided Churches of the evangelical faith to dwell together as one body. As I have said elsewhere, the only feasible organic unity is of organization, not of order.

With every one of these and many other fallacies we who advocate organic union must grapple. Cool intellectual assent to the principles of union will not suffice; we must have glowing zeal.

Happily, we are not left to-day without a definite plan to advance. There is, indeed, a better plan, for complete organic union, held in abeyance, because the time for it seems not yet at hand. The plan for federal organic union is now before the Churches. It is the plan of union of the American Council on Organic Union of the Evangelical Churches which was fully presented in the April number of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. This plan is being presented to the supreme governing or advisory body of every evangelical Church in our country. After it has been adopted by at least six of these denominations it will become operative, and they will unite as the "Churches of Christ in America," each retaining its present name and organization, and uniting in a superbody with delegated functions and authority, legislative, judicial and executive, after the pattern of the federal union of the states. In this the present evils of overchurching, overlapping efforts in missions and educa-

tion, etc., will be dealt with and progressively eliminated; constructive programmes will be adopted; the United Churches will present a solid front to the forces arrayed against Christ and His Kingdom. Doubtless the number of uniting Churches will increase from year to year, until the evangelical Christians of our land will nearly all be represented in the United Churches. Until then, and thenceforth, Forward! Let not the good work drag. It means the revivifying of Christ's people; it means the winning of thousands in place of hundreds of recruits for the army of the Lord; it means the greatest step in modern ages toward the fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer, "That they all may be one."

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPA- LIANS AND CONGREGATIONALISTS*

THE word Church is used in the New Testament in two distinct senses. Our Lord, as His words are recorded in the Gospel of St. Matthew, used twice, and twice only the word *ecclesia*, and it cannot be otherwise than significant that He employed the word with these two connotations. When He said, "Upon this rock will I build My Church," it is manifest He did not mean a single, local congregation. When He said, "Tell it to the Church," it is manifest that He did not mean a world-wide company existing through the centuries.

This distinction is in accordance with apostolic usage. The Church is the whole company of the disciples of which the risen Lord is the spiritual and living Head, which St. Paul has in mind when he says, "Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, * * * that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. "It is this all comprehensive Church which is the one body possessing "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," which is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone."

But again the New Testament uses the word Church referring to a local congregation, "the Church which is in Corinth," "the Church of Galatia," "the Church which is at Cenchreae," "the Church that is in the house of Prisca and Aquila." When the Apostle exhorts the Corinthian congregation to discipline the unworthy members it is clearly action by the local Church that he has in mind. Early Church history furnishes abundant exam-

*A paper adopted at a meeting of the two commissions of the Protestant Episcopal and Congregational Churches regarding the proposed canon.

ples of this two-fold usage. An appeal therefore to Scripture and to Christian history in defense of the one or the other of these emphases is alike possible. Both present real and important truths. Both should be equally kept in mind. Unfortunately Christian history too often shows the emphasis on the one aspect of the Church at the expense of the other. An over-emphasis on the organized unity has resulted in the papacy, with consequent rigidity of uniformity, centralization, and the stupendous assertion of infallibility.

An over-emphasis on the unity of the local Church results in independency, in the obscuration of the sense of historic continuity, and in the weakening of the feeling of the organic whole of which the local congregation should be a part.

Yet each of these aspects and uses of the word Church, consecrated by apostolic usage, contains truth which cannot be ignored, and both must be recognized as we seek a greater unity among the now divided membership of the household of God.

The time is now fully come when each Church is called upon to consider anew its own position in relation to the whole Church of God in the world. Each Church is to judge for itself, as it would be judged by its Lord, whether it so hold its own position as to prevent any other part of the Church from communion with the whole Church.

In the providence of God there has been laid upon this Joint Commission the solemn responsibility of considering in what manner it may become possible for the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Congregational Churches to overcome at a particular point the separation between them which is deplored alike by them all. The point so specified is central and vital. It means oneness at the very place, in the same act, in which the whole Church had its beginning in the presence of the Lord—

in the upper chamber and at the Last Supper. This is the vital significance of the proposals and the questions submitted by the action of the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the response of the National Council of the Congregational Churches. By this concurrent action the entire discussion of Church unity is brought down from the air and placed before the Churches as a practical question, which requires definitive action.

It will be obvious to thoughtful men that we may vainly hope to render any worthy and effective answer if we begin merely by restating our respective ecclesiastical positions and then proceeding by some give and take method of compromise to some merely external adjustment of our differences. Our respective communions may well require of us to render an answer to the particular points submitted to us which shall be more than an endeavor to throw a temporary bridge of expediency over the existing separation between us.

In entering therefore upon the duties with which we are charged we deem it to be our first obligation to determine together a method of procedure in which most hopefully the visible organic unity of the Churches may be sought until it shall be found. Such method seems to us to be not far to seek.

First, and always throughout our conferences and discussions, we are to keep in mind our part and obligation as partakers in the one succession of the life of Christ with His disciples. In the continuity of His life, spiritually and historically, always with His disciples, is the continuity of His Church in the world. Consequently the Christian method to be pursued in relation to the particular questions before us becomes clearer. (1) It will lead us first to seek out the religious values of the distinctive beliefs and customs of our communions. (2) These vital values are to be found both in their historical develop-

ment and in the present religious experience and worship of the Christian communions. (3) Given these values, we may then proceed to inquire of one another what guarantees, certified in our history or now of approved worth among us we may give to one another in Christ's name and for the extension of His rule in our time throughout the world. (4) Then, and by these signs, we may by the grace of God find ourselves prepared to render an assured account to the two Christian bodies, whose action has committed to us this great and solemn engagement, and meanwhile we may appeal to all the brethren in their conferences and discussions to labor with us for these same ends, and, in methods beyond all controversy, praying that in this providential hour of history the living Christ may be made manifest through His Church as Lord of the nations, and Redeemer of our civilization.

CHRISTIAN UNITY IN AUSTRALIA

BY REV. GEORGE HALL, ex-President Methodist Conference, Riverton,
South Australia.

SUCH a movement as that undertaken by the promoters of the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order cannot be expected to advance very rapidly because of its proportions and the number of persons and interests to consider. There has, however, already been a definite advance. The war has given the movement a decided momentum. The desire for a closer union of all the Churches is becoming more and more pronounced in nearly every part of the world. If an organic union cannot be achieved comparatively early, some form of federation, to prevent the overcrowding of agencies, must be attempted at once, while organized union remains the objective. Meanwhile the idea that the Churches are working in antagonism to each other is very wide of the truth. There is really a fine spirit of unity; but, lacking visibility, it does not sufficiently impress men. During the octave—January 18-25—Christians in every land were called upon to offer ardent supplication to God for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for the visible unity of all the followers. The appeal came from the leaders of the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order; and in South Australia it is supported by the bishops of the Episcopal Church, the president of the Methodist Conference, and the chief officers of some of the other Churches. In many social and political questions Great Britain has followed the example of Australia, and why should we not set an example in Church union? We have only to satisfy ourselves that a united Church is the will of God, and we are at liberty to work to realize it.

To-day all Methodism in every part of Australasia is one, and very happily one. The Presbyterian Churches many years ago became substantially one. The Congre-

gationalists and Baptists have their Australian general Assemblies in which their unity is manifested. The joint meetings of the various Church commissions on faith and order, and the happy conference of Anglican and non-Anglican Churches held in this city a year ago prove a disposition to bring about a real spiritual unity, until a visible unity shall be found practicable. Just now the most interesting attempt at organic union in the commonwealth is that initiated by the chief courts of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in 1906 and 1917. A basis of doctrine and polity was prepared and agreed to at a conference of representatives from all the states, which met in Melbourne in September, 1918. This basis has since been submitted to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia and the Congregational Union of Australia and New Zealand, and with reservations was accepted by large majorities. The question has also been considered by the annual assemblies of the three Churches and by the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church, and the district synods of the Methodist Church in all parts of the commonwealth. Every quarterly meeting of Australian Methodism has discussed the same basis. Should the negotiation be continued beyond May, the question will probably be also submitted to all the members of the Methodist Church. The voting thus far on the acceptance or otherwise of the proposed basis shows these results:—1. Presbyterian Church.—Six state assemblies, 236 for; 100 against. Presbyteries—26 “approved,” 18 “disapproved.” Persons at presbyteries voting “Yes,” 259; voting “No,” 208. 2. Methodist Church.—Voting in 38 synods—1,058 “Yes;” 278, “No;” 47 neutral. Voting 351 circuit quarterly meetings.—Persons present—7,359; “Yes,” 5,138; “No,” 1,748; neutral, 473. 3. Congregational Church.—Victorian Union—83 “Yes;” 11 “No.” N. S. W. Union—72 “Yes;” 3 “No.” Trien-

nial Union of Australia and New Zealand.—81 “Yes,” 4 “No.” The question will receive further attention from the Methodist Conferences after which the verdict of all the chief states’ courts will be known. The voting is accompanied by many suggested amendments of the basis, and those will be dealt with by State committees and the general committee in Melbourne, and probably also by the joint general committee or its executive. The opposition by Presbyterians in New South Wales and in Victoria is encouraged by the Presbyterian Church Defence Association, which, under the direction of Professor Rentoul, D.D., is issuing an extensive literature, and otherwise carrying on an active propaganda; but even this opposition to an organic union claims to desire some effective form of federation. It will be unfortunate if the Presbyterians should again be responsible in Australia, as they are in Canada, for preventing a union of Churches which are practically one in doctrine, and the leaders of which agreed on a policy of Church government that seems to retain the most desirable features of each Church. The Australian Churches are interested in the coming American conference, and already the Bishop of Willochra has been appointed to represent the Anglican Church of the commonwealth. It is hoped that the aims of the promoters of that World Conference will be advanced by the general and earnest observance of the Octave of Prayer.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

IN *The Constructive Quarterly*, New York, Dr. Newman Smyth has an article under the heading "A Proposed Approach Towards Unity in the United States," giving the history of the proposed concordat between the Episcopalians and the Congregationalists, which reaches back to the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops in London in 1908. The documents appeared in the July *QUARTERLY* of 1919 (page 41). One of the Episcopal bishops writes Dr. Smyth, "We have put the key in the lock." Dr. Smyth, commenting on this statement, says, "At least it may be said that a door has been put ajar in the wall of separation between these two communions, which if once it shall be opened, no man can shut." Continuing he says:

"Its reception was such as usually befalls any new departure of faith. Thoughtful men waiting to see what may be the leading of the Spirit for the Churches in this time, refrained from hasty judgment, while extremists on both sides were quick to condemn it, and, apparently unconscious of it themselves, from quite similar reasons. Indeed, it is interesting and somewhat instructive to observe how extreme denominationalists and extreme churchmen threw back and forth very much the same ecclesiastical stones at each other. If their objections were printed in one column, and their names printed in parallel columns on both sides of it, the names might be easily transposed; it does not seem to have occurred to them to seek first for the fundamental unities of the Kingdom of God. But more than ever the intrinsic values of our beliefs are to be sought for, like hid treasures, and when found put to use in exchange, if the Churches shall do the Lord's business for our world now as good and profitable servants. When each Church shall cease to think of the Church in terms of its own interests, and think rather of the things that are its own in terms of the whole Church of God, then the day of the visible and efficient unity of the Church will be at hand.

"Emphasis is to be laid on the method which has been followed in this approach towards unity. 1. It aims at a particular point. It does not begin by submitting a complete plan for Church union. It does not involve a general ecclesiastical reconstruction. The point from which it proceeds is central, not peripheral; vital, not governmental. It would begin where Christ began with His disciples—the Communion. 2. The proposed canon consequently is a common endeavor to find some way in which the chief obstacle to the desired intercommunion of believers may be removed. It would seek to do this without violence to the principles or disregard of the conscientious scruples of any who hold the sacrament to

be a gift of Christ to His Church to be kept and administered as a sacred trust. The great difficulty in the way has been the question of a valid ordination.

"The proposed canon opens a way round the divisive obstacle of validity of ordination, so that we may meet on the other side of it and go on our way rejoicing. It offers to accomplish this by giving guarantees which in the estimation of both may be sufficient for the right administration of the sacrament. It offers a guarantee which it is believed may be acceptable to the scruples of the strictest episcopal theologian, while at the same time it may be freely acceded to by a minister of another communion without violence to his own denominational convictions. The concordat offers a way to solve the vexed question of the validity of orders. It does not raise the question of differences of views concerning the intention of the sacrament. It is to both a divinely instituted means of grace—a visible means of realizing the presence of Christ."

Dr. Wendel, formerly a Congregational minister, now an Episcopal rector, writing in *The American Church Monthly*, New Brunswick, N. J., (Episcopalian) says:

"Is it the purpose of the proposed amendment to our constitution and of the proposed new canon on ordination to make an easy way for Congregational ministers to enter the ministry of our Church, while they still hold fast to their old status of Congregational ministers? I have no doubt that there are those who think that these supplementary orders would actually enable Congregational ministers to serve our Churches, and that they could pass from the pastorate of one of their societies to the rectorate of one of our Churches with the same facility with which they pass from a Congregational to a Presbyterian pastorate, and *vice versa*. Also by such supplementary orders they and many of our Broad Church rectors would consider the way open to a free and untrammelled 'exchange of pulpits,' with all that implies.

"And what of our mission field? I fear in many a New England village where Congregationalism is strong and our Church is weak, a Congregational pastor with supplementary episcopal orders, could so exercise his functions, as either to prevent the formation of a new mission, or to swallow up an old but weak mission, unless the people were unusually strong in their churchmanship."

In commenting on the concordat *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, (Episcopalian) says:

"All of us must keep an open mind as to this question, for the two commissions are trying earnestly and honestly to answer it, and by no word of ours shall the answer be made more difficult. If a relationship is to become possible, it is certain that *the people*, as well as the minister, must become active parties to it; that it must be made perfectly clear to them that the sacrament that will be administered to them by their priests will be different *in kind* from what they have been accustomed to. They must show by their changed attitude toward it that in that sacrament they truly 'discern the Lord's Body.' They must prepare for it, as the devout of all ages have prepared. We should suppose that the confirmation of the entire congregation by the bishop (so far as they were baptized and desired to become communicants) would be the step, in which both parties would agree, by which the congregation would give evidence of its acceptance of the new relationship.

“We believe, too, that the provisions as to the celebration of Holy Communion noted in the resolutions of General Convention can only become effective by means of a form for such celebration. This need not be our own Order for Holy Communion, but any form submitted should be passed on not only by the bishop of the diocese but by a commission of experts representing the national Church.

“And finally, we believe that for the protection of the Congregational priest he must be brought within the purview of at least a considerable part of our canon law, or its equivalent.

“These three observations seem to us to cover the chief essentials, other than those that have already been made clear, if such a relationship as is proposed shall be worked out. And if that form of relationship be desirable at all, we cannot believe that the eminent Congregationalists will take exception to any of the propositions. Without these the plan would certainly fail. On our own side, the relationship, though anomalous, and only an ‘approach’ to unity, would not be absolutely without precedent, for the early connection of the Swedish Churches in Pennsylvania and Delaware with the American Church presented somewhat similar anomalies. And strict logic is a poor guide in things spiritual.”

Referring to the concordat in his recent convention address, the Rt. Rev. F. F. Reese, Bishop of Georgia, says:

“There are some things for us to remember in this connection. This is an effort on the part of our own Church and certain distinguished and godly members of Congregational Churches to find an approach toward Christian unity. As such it merits our sympathetic, reverent, and prayerful consideration. If the Church has been sincere and honest in its efforts to promote such unity, if we meant what we said in the Chicago-Lambeth Declaration, we cannot reject or repudiate this effort without stultifying ourselves in the sight of God and of all honest men. If we say we are willing to confer with our Christian brethren on the basis of our declaration, but really mean to say that we intend to stand pat and require all men to repudiate their own past, humbly to offer themselves to us on our own terms alone and to become Protestant Episcopalians in every jot and tittle, we may be in our judgment most unimpeachable catholic churchmen, but we shall be mighty lonely in the world and deservedly so. Our attitude will be understood only at the Vatican, for it is precisely similar to its attitude. But the Vatican will not be drawn to us nevertheless, for it has its own opinion of what it calls our pretensions. It understands the stand-pat attitude but it reserves to itself the privilege of maintaining it as a basis of unity. In the meantime Christian unity so far as we are concerned will be an iridescent dream.

“There are indeed, principles of catholic faith and order for which we are responsible and which it would be disloyalty not only to our historic heritage but to the Christian world to impair or surrender. But let us be sure that what we so denominate are really such principles. Nothing in the past has so promoted division as an obstinate temper, and a narrow misconception of what constitute principles. Unreasonable and narrow conscientiousness is one of the most fatal endowments of mankind. Ecclesiastical self-complacency and hauteur is not an attractive but a repellent force. There can be no unity or approach to unity without sweet reasonableness and without mutual friendliness and respect and without the spirit of reasonable and brotherly compromise. ‘In essentials, unity, in non-essentials, liberty, in all things charity.’”

The following announcement has been sent out by the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on the World Conference on Faith and Order, which will hold its preliminary session at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12-20:

"The Spirit of God is moving over the chaos of the divisions of Christians and slowly, but surely, the world is coming to see, first, that only by universal obedience to Christ's new commandment of love is there any hope for the future of civilization and for enduring peace and righteousness, international, industrial or social. Next that only the visible unity of Christians can convert the world to Christ and so establish that new commandment. Then that only through fervent and regular prayer can Christians obtain grace to surrender their wills to God's, that His will for unity may be achieved and Christ, the one Way, the one Truth, the one Life, be all in all. Lastly it has become clear that if Christians be truly filled with Christ's love, they will seek unity through conference, not controversy, for in conference they can understand and appreciate one another and so help one another to a more complete comprehension of infinite truth.

"So the World Conference on the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ seems now assured, and a preliminary meeting to discuss how best to proceed further, and perhaps to fix the date and place of the World Conference itself, will be held, God willing, at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12 (western calendar), 1920. All the great family groups, save one, of the Churches which worship Jesus Christ as God Incarnate and Saviour will be represented by delegates from every quarter of the earth, and of almost every race and every tongue. Invitations have been sent to, and been accepted by, all Europe, Australia and America, all Christian Asia and Africa, and the islands of the sea. The languages of the various delegates will be English, French, German, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Dutch, Italian, Russian, Greek, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Serbian and perhaps Armenian and Arabic.

"Notices of the appointment of delegates to the Geneva meeting are beginning to be received. Already the following have been named:

Protestant Episcopal Church.—Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D., 1612 Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Illinois; Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., 187 Fulton Street, New York, New York; Robert H. Gardiner, 174 Water street, Gardiner, Maine. *Seventh Day Baptist General Conference*: Rev. Gerard Velthuysen, Jr., 22 Weteringplantsoen, Amsterdam, Holland. *Ecumenical Patriarchate, Constantinople*: His Grace Germanos, Rector of the Theological Academy, Halki, via Constantinople, Turkey. *Church of Greece*: Very Rev. Archimandrite Chrysostom Papadopoulos, The University, Athens, Greece; Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos, 7 Odos Massalias, Athens, Greece; Very Rev. Constantine Callinicos, B. D., Hr. Broughton, Manchester, England. *Methodist Conference of New Zealand*: Rev. E. O. Blamires, care W. Aykroyd, Methodist Times, London, England, *Disciples of Christ*: Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., Seminary House, Baltimore, Maryland; Rev. F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Carew Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. F. S. Idleman, D.D., 142 West 81st Street, New York, N. Y.; Rev. R. H. Miller, Kansas City, Mo. (Alternate); Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 504 N. Fulton Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland (alternate). *Church of Serbia*: Rt. Rev. Nicolai Velimirovic, D.D., Bishop of Zicha, Serbia (to be accompanied by two priests). *Reformed Church in the United States*: Rev. James I. Good, D.D., 3262 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. George W. Richards, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.; Rev. Charles E. Schaeffer, D.D., 422 South 50th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. *Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland*:

Rev. J. E. Roberts, M. A., B.D., 32 Heaton Road, Withington, Manchester, England; Rev. F. C. Spurr, 3 Dartmouth Road, Brondesbury, London, N. W. 2, England. *Presbyterian Church of New Zealand*: Rev. W. Gray Dixon, M.A., Roslyn Manse, Dunedin, New Zealand. *Church of Norway*: Rt. Rev. Bishop J. Tandberg, Christiania, Norway; Prof. Dr. Juris A. Taranger, LL.D., Slemdal, Christiania, Norway; Rev. N. B. Thvedt, M.A., C. T., Nils Juelsgt 4, Christiania, Norway. Alternates: Archdeacon J. Gleditsch, D.D., Vor Frelzers Kirke, Christiania, Norway; Supreme Judge Edward Hambro, Oscarsgt, 78b, Christiania, Norway; Pastor V. Koren, Nordstrand, Christiania, Norway.

"The Commission of the American Episcopal Church is deeply grateful to God who has permitted it thus to accomplish its function of securing the coöperation of the Churches of the world in this great effort to prepare the way for that visible unity of Christians which will set free the power of the Gospel of man's redemption. That Commission has frequently urged the paramount need of prayer. It now repeats that request and especially begs that all the Christian world will make the next Feast of Pentecost, or Whitsunday, May 23 (western calendar), a special day of earnest prayer that God the Holy Spirit will preside over the meeting at Geneva and guide the diversity of race and tongue, of modes of worship, of creedal statements, toward visible harmony in the one faith they all share in common in the one Lord.

"And we urge our brethren of the Roman Catholic Church to join with us in prayer that day. We are grieved that they will not be represented officially at Geneva, and we know that our grief will be shared by many thousands of them, all over the world, who are looking with eager hope to this movement."

William T. Manning, Chairman Executive Committee.
Robert H. Gardiner, Secretary.

Then follows another communication addressed to the members of the Commission as follows:

To all the members of all the Commissions on the World Conference on Faith and Order, and to all the delegates to the preliminary meeting at Geneva:

To avoid waste of time, the meeting at Geneva next August will need to adopt a programme to guide its discussions and concentrate its thoughts. The following suggestions have come from different sources, but for them no Commission or individual is specially responsible. It is hoped that out of them, with the help of careful criticism by all who are engaged in the undertaking, a useful programme can be made, to be proposed at the first session for adoption or amendment.

This paper is sent not only to all the delegates to Geneva of whose appointment notice has been received, but to all the members of all the Commissions, in the hope that they will contribute their criticisms.

Suggestions should be sent immediately to Robert H. Gardiner, 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U. S. A. Letters which cannot reach him before July 1, 1920, should be addressed in care of Lombard Odier and Co., Geneva, Switzerland.

The Commission of the American Episcopal Church, having practically completed the work of issuing the invitations for participation in the movement, now looks to all the Commissions to join in the active preparations for the Geneva meeting and for the World Conference itself.

Our Lord prayed for the unity of His disciples as the evidence potent to convince the world of His mission by the Father. Therefore the object of the World Conference is to prepare the way for effective lifting up of Christ before the world.

The World Conference is world-wide, including in its scope every Church which confesses Jesus Christ as God made man.

The World Conference is not to undertake direct effort for unity, but to prepare the way for such efforts by *the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one.*

It will take time to complete the preparations for the World Conference. The object of the Geneva meeting is to consider the lines of preparation, and what should be done to spread the spirit of conference, as distinguished from that of controversy and proselytism, among the Churches, and to prepare the minds and hearts of the faithful for the results of the World Conference.

During the preparation, partial and local efforts at reunion should be encouraged, for every success in such efforts may spread the desire for complete reunion, foster the conference spirit, and show that difficulties may not be insuperable.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Do the Churches meanwhile need, as a part of the preparation for the Conference, a deeper and more efficient recognition of the necessity of a genuine and true repentance for their sins in their relations with one another?

2. Do we need to dwell more on the unity of personal devotion to Christ?

3. Should the distinction be made more clear between matters of opinion and the faith once delivered to the saints?

4. How far are matters of order and government necessary to essential unity?

5. How far can the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or either of them, be taken as statements of our agreements in matters of faith, and as guides for the effort to understand our differences?

6. What are the actual groups, considered with regard to their standards of faith and order, which should be represented at the World Conference?

7. How far can groups which hold certain positions in common (for example, Congregational, Presbyterian or Episcopal polities), act in common with regard to those positions?

8. How shall the ultimate Conference be composed so as to include adequate representation of the different communions or groups of communions?

9. What preparations should the representatives of the different groups be called upon to make, and what *ad interim* committees should be appointed to bring them about?

10. What further invitations, if any, shall be issued for participation in the movement?

11. Date and place of the ultimate Conference.

12. Appointment of a committee representative of various views on faith and order, to make all further arrangements for the World Conference. Or shall there be a very small executive committee with a central office? Shall there be one or more executive secretaries, in either case?

13. What, if any, publications or preliminary reports shall be issued? Who shall edit them?

14. How shall the expenses of the movement, after the adjournment of this meeting, be met?

The awakening of the Orthodox Eastern Church in Christian unity is attested by *The Ecclesiastical Truth*, Constantinople, as follows:

“Union when attained will undoubtedly centralize the spiritual, moral, and material forces already separately operative, and will dispose and direct them to better effect, so that the great and high purpose which underlies the teaching of the Lord may be realized to the fullest extent. But is it easy (someone will ask) to do away so readily with the discords and differences existing between the Churches, differences which have worked like leaven in the Churches, and which have formed a substantial part of their individual life? Psychologically, is it easy for Church A or Church B to proclaim today publicly as unfounded that which for centuries it has held as well-grounded and right? Is not hypersensitiveness common to the Churches too? And will it not be kindled the more by the very idea that by the denial and rejection of this or that opinion their attraction and prestige would risk diminution in the eyes of their own Christians?

“Admittedly, from such a standpoint, the question appears pretty hard to solve. But the difficulty or ease of its solution depends chiefly upon the dispositions in which participating Churches assemble, and the basis upon which the discussion is placed.

“If each Church comes to the conference-table convinced that its points of view and its arguments are the only right and well-founded ones, and has determined in advance to insist steadily upon them, with intent to impose its opinions dictatorily upon the others, without any doubt the hope of union will again be frustrated and the chasm between the Churches will be still further widened. If, on the contrary, each Church is possessed by the holy desire and the pure disposition to see this destructive disunion ended, and, guided thereby, proceeds with efforts at reconciliation and concession wherever and to whatever extent it gives way without injury to things of importance, the success of the union of all will inevitably be assured.”

The bishop of Uganda contributes an article in *The Nineteenth Century*, London, dealing with the way to Christian reunion and says:

“What shall we say of the fact that, with the Apostles themselves still living, with the new order but just established, God chose Saul of Tarsus, a man who stood outside the apostolic succession, disclaiming expressly any authority from Jerusalem? * * * Actually He is so working to-day. However strongly we may hold to the doctrine of apostolic succession as the means through which God normally works, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that actually, in every part of the world to-day, He is working also and equally through other means.”

Sherwood Eddy, associate general Y. M. C. A. secretary for India, writing in *The Christian Work*, New York, says:

“The Syrian Church has not yet taken final action on the proposed union. But their Committee on Union has drawn up a report which shows the spirit of the Church. We quote it in part:

PROPOSAL FOR CHURCH UNION

‘As a Committee on Union of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, we have received the invitation from certain pastors of the Anglican Communion and the South India United Church who met at Tranquebar, May 1 and 2, 1919, in the Ministers’ Conference on Church Union, requesting the mem-

bers of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church prayerfully to consider with them the question of uniting the divided Churches of Christ in India. This appeals to us the more deeply as we ourselves have been praying fervently for years for the healing of the sad divisions which have rent asunder the Church of Christ. These divisions have been particularly disastrous and destructive in India, where the Church has at times become almost a by-word among the non-Christians, where religion which was meant to unite mankind has actually divided it.

'We agree with you that union is the will of God, and that instead of being responsible for perpetuating the divisions of Christ's Church we should seek to answer our Lord's prayer that we all may be one.

'We also believe that the awakening of a new national consciousness in India and the entry upon a new era of responsible government makes it imperative that the Church also, instead of wasting its strength in internal strife, should face the new conditions and work for unity in order to meet the overwhelming demand of the hour. After centuries of the bitter experience of disunion we, like yourselves, do not desire to perpetuate such divisions.

'We are glad to see that you propose union not on any basis of compromise but on one of comprehension, where each body shall contribute its treasures and tradition to the enrichment of the whole. We understand that you do not ask us to change our long cherished convictions, principles and practices, which we have maintained for centuries in the face of bitter persecution. We also understand that you do not ask us to surrender our autonomy or lose our freedom of action in things pertaining to our own communion.

'(1) We have held that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation and have stood for the principle of the open Bible, which has never been forbidden to the people.

'(2) We have always held the Nicene Creed and it forms a part of our regular services. While we accept all the doctrines contained in the Apostles' Creed, it has not been our practice to use it in formal worship.

'(3) We have always held the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, administered with Christ's words of institution and the elements He used.

'(4) We have always stood strongly for maintaining the historic episcopate, but we agree with you that it is no part of our duty to call in question the validity of each others' orders.

'From 1054 A.D., when the Western and Eastern Churches divided, we stood with the Eastern Churches and maintained the original wording of the Nicene Creed, objecting to the later Western insertion of the single word *filioque* (from the Son). We even now say that the Holy Spirit "proceeding from the Father is worshipped with the Father and the Son." (St. John 15:25.) While under this controversy there lay deep race prejudice between the East and West, and the firm refusal of the East to admit the growingly exclusive claims of the Papacy, we nevertheless feel to-day that it is incomprehensible to think of perpetuating the division of the Church of Christ and shattering its strength over a contention about a word. Confronted to-day by the call to return to our original obligation of winning the world, we find ourselves united by a common task and in the very presence of Christ our Lord lifted to a plane which transcends the medieval dissensions which formerly divided us. A century ago a mission of help was sent by the Anglican Church which led to the quickening and vitalizing of our own isolated communion. Deeply indebted as we are for the self-denying labors of the representatives of the Anglican Church on our behalf, we are all the more glad that the proposal for union comes also from the Church to which we have been so long indebted. * * *

'We are ready to consider union now that a definite proposal has come from members of the Anglican and South India United Churches. As the Church of England has for three decades suggested conditions for union, we hope that our synod will also favorably consider the same and take steps for effecting union upon this common ground. We understand that there is no question of the absorption of one Church by another, but that standing on the principle of spiritual equality before our common Lord, we shall each seek to contribute the riches of our own spiritual inheritance to the united Church of the future. We shall be glad if this union brings the long desired dawn of a new day of Christian unity, when there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither East nor West, but as our Lord prayed we shall all be one in Him.

'While writing unofficially without committing our Metropolitan and the synod of our Church, which will have to take final action upon the matter, we as the Corresponding Committee on Union of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, with the blessing of God, agree to pray and work toward union upon such a basis.

'Abraham Mar Thoma, Malabar, Suffragen.

'C. P. PHILIPOSE.

'V. P. MAMMAN.'

"The coming together of these three Churches upon the mission field would unite in one body the converts of the mission work of England, Scotland and America. The Anglicans would contribute the strength and world communion of the Western Church, the Syrians would bring their loyalty to primitive, apostolic tradition, while the South India United Church would bring its evangelistic fervor, its development of the laity and its abundant life and service.

"These three bodies in South India alone have some 550,000 Christians. Would not this be the first time in nine hundred years that the breach between the East and the West has been healed? It will be remembered that the split between the Eastern and Western Church came over one word in the Creed, the Latin word *filiusque*, "and the Son." Should the Churches of Christendom be divided forever over the question of a single word, ever disputing concerning dogmas and doctrines? The whole world, in desperate need, calls for the whole Church to face in unity such a titanic task. Would it not be the first time in four centuries the great division between the Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches has been united? Surely all who desire the realization of spiritual unity and its embodiment in corporate and visible union will hope that these Churches may not only effect such a union, but may bring their message to the divided Churches of the West. May not these Churches upon the mission field be leading the way toward the Church of the future and the reunion of a divided Christendom?"

The manifesto signed by seven hundred British Wesleyan ministers presents their attitude both toward Methodist reunion and the larger reunion as follows:

"In view of the suggestions submitted to the last Conference by the Committee on Methodist Union, we think the time has come when we should make known our attitude in regard to the whole question. We desire to state most clearly that we are not in any sense hostile to union with the other Methodist Churches, or any other branch of the Christian Church, and are willing to do all in our power to promote union, earnestly desiring to see the speedy fulfilment of our Lord's prayer, 'that they may all be one.'

But since we value the heritage bequeathed to us, not only or mainly for reasons of sentiment, but as the product of experience in actual Church life and work from Wesley's to the present day, we question the wisdom of effecting a small measure of reunion by abandoning principles and a position which peculiarly fit us for reunion on a much larger scale. We are unwilling to take any step which would destroy or weaken the distinctive features and traditions of our Church, and keenly desire to preserve those traditions which have always made Wesleyan Methodism to be conspicuously a Church which is the friend of all schools of ecclesiastical and political faith, and the enemy of none. We maintain therefore that if union is to be effected with the other Methodist Churches, the following conditions are essential:—

“It shall be a union that will really unite Methodists, and not cause numerous defections on the one hand of such Wesleyans as preserve their traditional sympathy with the Church of England, or, on the other hand, of such Methodists as lean to independency and to political partisanship.

“The pastoral office shall be so guarded as to make it quite clear that ministers are employes of the Church, but men ordained to exercise specific functions set forth in the Pastoral Epistles.

“The general Wesleyan custom, sanctioned by the almost unbroken usage of the Church, shall be preserved in regard to the sacraments—namely, that the administration be confined to ordained persons.

“There shall be safeguards assuring that nothing be done so contrary to the conception of orders in other Churches as to make wider reunion more difficult.

“The Conference in its pastoral session shall in no sense be a sub-committee of the Conference, submitting any of its decisions to that Conference, but shall be in every way independent of any relation thereto, and that legally, as at present. The Pastoral Conference, too, shall continue to give access and voting power to all ministers as at present.

“We appeal therefore to all who in general agree with the views here set forth to join us in taking such action as may be deemed advisable. There is clear evidence that if some action or protest be not made soon we shall be committed as a Church to some scheme on the lines of the suggestions made to the last Conference, and told that we have gone too far to be able honourably to turn back.”

Upon this *The Guardian*, London, (Anglican) comments as follows:

“Clearly, then, the Wesleyans, in relation to the minor bodies on the one hand and to the Church of England on the other, have reached a position precisely analogous to that of the Church of England in relation to Nonconformity on the one hand and to the two great branches of the Catholic Church on the other. They desire reunion with the separated Methodists just as we desire reunion with the Nonconformists, and they have the question of the larger reunion in England to consider, just as we have to consider the ultimate reunion of Catholic Christendom. Hence their embarrassment and ours. They naturally desire the reunion of all that shares the common name of Methodism, but they recognise that they would be paying too dear for that reunion if it should imperil the reunion of English Christianity. We also naturally desire the reunion of all that shares the common heritage of English Christendom, but we are assured that thereby to imperil the reunion of Christendom at large would be in the highest degree unwise.

What, then is the way out of this embarrassing situation for the Wesleyans and for ourselves? Already it is clear that there is no prospect whatever of a return to absolute uniformity. We may deprecate the Ref-

ormation as much as we will, but it remains a fact of history that, ever since the Reformation, Englishmen have claimed the right to do as they like in the matter of Church allegiance, and they have done it and will do it. We shall always have to reckon with the fact that any man who happens to be dissatisfied, and to possess enough money to build a meeting-house, is at liberty to start a new sect, and no power exists to hinder him. Within the Church of England itself there is now more freedom than was ever dreamt of in the early centuries of the Church's history. It is one of the sources of our strength though it may also be a source of embarrassment in our ecclesiastical administration. Anything therefore in the way of a reunion which is to be practicable or possible must be based upon a liberal toleration of everything not absolutely contrary to the Catholic faith and use. The advice we would give to the Wesleyans, if they ask for our advice, would be that they should by all means seek the reunion of Methodism upon a broad and tolerant basis, but that they should resolutely and steadfastly withstand any surrender of principles which they regard as vital and should cheerfully accept the consequence, whatever it may be."

Lord Hugh Cecil, in the London *Morning Post*, pleads for an international Christianity rather than national and says:

"If Christian reunion means only the reunion of British Christians, I do not even desire it. If it were possible to join together all the Christians of Great Britain except those of the Roman communion in one British Church, I should view that Church with profound dislike and distrust. For it would be saturated with nationalism, and we ought to have learnt, if never before then from the war, how alien nationalism is from Christianity. It was nationalism that made the war; we hope to chain that evil spirit even in secular affairs by the League of Nations; let us not suffer its wicked influence in the Church. A great British Church could not hope to escape this danger. What we need in Christian reunion is to gain that element of catholicity which the Church of England and the Free Churches alike now lack—namely, an international character. It is in this respect that popery may most fairly claim to be more catholic than the Church of England. If we want to shut the mouths of Roman critics here is their strongest theme. Here they have the advantage of us, and we can but be silent and ashamed.

Is it a dream to fancy the divisions of Christendom reduced to four—a Papal Church, an Episcopal Church, a Presbyterian Church, and a Congregationalist Union of Churches? All four would be international, all four would be world-wide. This would certainly make the remaining process of reunion easier. Strong bodies can more flexibly concede; they do not stand on points of dignity; they are not afraid of being swallowed up and lost in some larger and more powerful body. Moreover, in a world-wide religious body there would be a different atmosphere. National prejudices and peculiarities would be exorcised. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists would all be better catholics than to-day."

The Living Church, Milwaukee, (Episcopalian) regards all Churches as reflecting national characteristics and says:

"All national Churches present particular types and characteristics. National Churches that are self-governing differ in many respects from each other. In that manner the Catholic Church, though spiritually one, is everywhere presented with local variations.

"It may probably be said that in no single land is the Church *perfectly* catholic; that is to say, so devoid of local or national characteristics as to reflect perfectly *all* the long history of the Church, unmarked by the particular history or bias of the particular Church.

"It follows that the totality of Christian experience throughout the whole Catholic Church much exceeds the experience of the Church in any one land. Roman theory to the contrary notwithstanding, the Latin Churches are the poorer for being at swords' points with the conservative Churches of Greece and Russia and the radical Churches of England and the United States; and our own Churches are the poorer for their isolation from the intimate life and thought both of the Greek and of the Latin communions. The balance between the national and the catholic has been sadly wrenched by the loss of unity between the three groups of Churches, and the three types that have thus been created are probably, all of them, provincialized. What is common to them all is 'catholic'; wherein the groups differ among themselves they are, respectively, Roman, Greek, and Anglican."

The Mansfield resolutions, which appeared in the January QUARTERLY (p. 8), are faring badly. *The Christian World*, London (Free Church), speaking of the interpretation made by Canons Temple and Lacy, says:

"The Free Church members of the Mansfield College Conference have had little to say about it, but the High Anglican members have been kept busy since trying to placate their alarmed friends. Their explanations are a little disappointing. They say the Free Church members quite understood that episcopacy was taken for granted in the reunited Church, and the phrases of the resolutions were clearly chosen and accepted as a sort of camouflage. Both Canon Temple and Canon Lacy meant, and mean, by reunion that the Anglican Church organization and doctrine are to be accepted by the Free Churches, and that all ministers, sooner or later, must be ordained under the apostolic succession.

"Canon Temple says plainly in last week's *Church Times* that he cares more for the present unity of the Anglican Church than for any union with Nonconformists, and adds: 'I would rather wait indefinitely than drive out from the Church even the extreme "Catholic" section or outrage the consciences of any devout churchmen.' The two canons, when they signed the statement that the different denominations 'are equally, as corporate groups, within the one Church of Christ,' now explain that they did not mean that they are 'on terms of perfect equality in status and function.' All they meant (they say) is that the various groups are 'equally within' the Church. This is only juggling with words, and we remain pretty much where we were."

Sir Robertson Nicoll of *The British Weekly*, London, (Free Church), says:

"We earnestly and respectfully remonstrate against the continuance of these conferences. It ought to be evident to the dullest eyes that any little concession made is immediately retracted, or rather, we ought perhaps to say, is expressed so doubtfully that it may mean anything or nothing.

“It is our deliberate opinion that those mischievous meetings have done more to separate Nonconformists from the Church than to attract them. It is a great evil that some of our leaders have talked as if episcopacy must be the form of government for the future Church. To that we have the very strongest objection. Episcopacy has not worked so well either in England or Scotland as to give ground for any such belief, and those Free Church leaders who have conceded it are not speaking of the rank and file, who are watching this question and have their minds made up. Courageous Christian bishops and clergymen may do much by taking their own line, and the fulminations of their opponents only provoke ridicule among the general public who are not narrow and take small account of ecclesiastical and doctrinal differences.”

At the instance of Canon T. A. Lacy, of Worcester, according to *Public Opinion*, London, the English Church Union adopted March the 24th the following resolutions:

“This council, humbly adhering to the prescriptions of the sacred canons and the practice of the Catholic Church in regard to the avoidance of communion with schismatics, approves the following propositions in principle:—

“(1) Corporate groups of Christians, separated by schism, ought to be received into communion by the proper authority, if they show a desire to close the schism and are found orthodox.

“(2) They may then lawfully continue as corporate groups, retaining such features of their former organisation as are consistent with catholic faith and practice.

“(3) Their ministers, if they desire it and are found to be personally qualified, should forthwith be admitted to Holy Orders.”

“A rider in the following terms was moved by the Rev. C. B. Lucas and adopted, together with the resolution:—

“That the council cannot accept the Mansfield College statement on reunion since this statement is at least capable of being interpreted as laying down a position with reference to the Church which the council cannot admit, and as obscuring the truth as to the necessity of episcopal ordination.”

The Challenge, London (Anglican), has this to say regarding the Mansfield resolutions:

“A group of leading churchmen have issued a manifesto in reply to the Mansfield resolutions; they claim that reunion is only possible on the basis of the episcopal succession. So far we entirely agree. We think the authors of this manifesto might in ordinary fairness have inserted words to show that they recognize the fact that many signatories of the Mansfield resolutions also agree with them, and signed those resolutions on that understanding. This, however, is relatively unimportant. Our trouble with this manifesto is that, like most utterances proceeding from the ‘Catholic school, it offers no suggestion for advance beyond the necessity for maintaining the principle of episcopacy. The Council of the English Church Union did lately issue a pronouncement which, though couched in terms unfamiliar to our generation, made a very substantial advance; if the Mansfield Conference has no other effect than the calling forth of that pronouncement, it will have done great good. For the prob-

lem of reunion on this side is mainly a problem of preserving what the Catholic school specially upholds. It may be that when the problem of reunion with Rome or the East becomes a matter of practical politics, it will be chiefly a problem of preserving what Evangelicals specially uphold. Any advance on the definitely Catholic side towards reunion is of immense importance. Meanwhile, the most important task is to explain the reasons why we uphold the principle of episcopacy so rigorously. It is because we believe that we have here something of supreme value to the spiritual life of the Church. We do not even desire that it should be accepted as a concession to our prejudices or convictions; we do not desire that it should be accepted in the spirit that prompts the enquiry 'If we do this for you, what do you propose to do for us?' We believe episcopacy to be of supreme value; we hope that those who are now without it will come to desire it for itself, just as we desire certain gifts which they have in greater measure than ourselves."

Commenting on the proposals of Mansfield Conference *The Challenge*, London, again says,

"Indeed, the principles insisted on by that Conference command our complete support. The first of these is that the great denominations should be dealt with as 'Churches,' really constituent part of the one Holy Catholic Church. This is fundamental. Members of those bodies cannot consent to negotiate on any other terms, not from reasons of corporate self-respect or pride, but because to do so would be to deny their own experience of the grace of God and therefore to commit blasphemy. Many Anglicans still hope for reunion by way of submission; that cannot come and ought not to come. It is not only that the Free Churches ought not to deny their own experience of divine grace; the peculiar emphasis and balance which each of them has achieved represents something of permanent spiritual value, which the united Church will need. It appears, therefore, that both principle and expediency require the recognition of the separated denominations as being corporately, and as groups, within the One Body of Christ, and of the reality of their ministries. In this connection it will be an advantage if we can leave behind the technical questions of guarantees and turn our attention to the operation of the Holy Spirit, as a matter of indisputable fact, in those denominations. Our attitude to them cannot be more grudging of recognition than was the Apostolic Church of Jerusalem towards the Gentile Christians. Among them as amongst ourselves we recognise Christ in His members.

"From that starting point we pass to the consideration of practical steps. If these are to lead towards reunion they must be taken by the whole body in every case and not isolated demonstrations by individuals who represent only themselves. Owing to the immense emphasis laid by the Free Churches on the ministry of the Word it is natural for them to desire that recognition of their Church status should express itself in an occasional 'interchange of pulpits.' The phrase is unfortunate, but it has established itself in popular usage. Further we agree with the Oxford resolutions in their desire that, subject to the same authority, there should be mutual admission to the Lord's Table. This does not mean any encouragement to Anglicans to communicate with Free churchmen or vice versa; it means exactly what it says, namely, that when a communicant member of one body presents himself at the altar of another he should be received and not repelled. Indeed, we believe it is already

the law of the Catholic Church that no man so presenting himself of his own motion can be repelled unless he is personally and individually excommunicate. We would especially urge upon Anglicans that just because we believe that we are entrusted with a special treasure in the communion celebrated according to Catholic order, we should be ready to welcome those who are not Anglicans so that they may begin to appreciate what we have and they lack. If such persons begin to attend frequently, they must of course be asked to accept the full discipline of the Church of whose ministrations they are availing themselves. But we would discourage Anglicans from communicating with Free churchmen just because it is here that we have something to safeguard; our own position in the matter of order is not so secure in the recognition of Christendom (to put it mildly) as to permit us to compromise it, and what is sometimes called 'The return visit' is bound to lead many to suppose that we attach little importance to order in relation to the Eucharist. Yet one great part of the significance of the Eucharist—fellowship with the Church of all times and all places—is liable to be lost if the expression of it in an episcopally ordained ministry is allowed to lapse."

The recent general Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. made interesting record in its favorable attitude toward unity. Of the meeting *The Congregationalist*, Boston, says:

"The Presbyterian General Assembly, meeting in Philadelphia, was able to take a joyful share in great forward strides toward the reunion of the Churches of its order. First presented themselves the delegates of the Welsh Presbyterian Church, representing a communion of some 15,000 members, which has just merged itself with the main current of Northern Presbyterianism, with power to perfect that union. Next came news of the unanimous vote by which the Southern Presbyterian Church had adopted the plan for the union, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, the confederation of the Reformed bodies holding the Presbyterian system. The plan involves the retention of a legal autonomy by the present communions, with a biennial General Assembly in which all would be represented. Difficulties would thus be avoided in regard to endowments and all that is valuable in the history and traditions of the now separate bodies retained. It is expected to unite under this confederation the larger Presbyterian Churches North and South, the Dutch and the German Reformed Churches and other Presbyterian bodies."

In *The Contemporary Review*, London, Rev. J. Scott Lidgett writes under "The Anglican Church and Evangelical Nonconformity," as follows:

Limiting the subject, then, to that of the Reunion of the Anglican Church and the non-Episcopal Evangelical Churches it may confidently be affirmed that any projects of reunion will be hopeless from the outset unless they satisfy the four following conditions:—

"1. They must be based upon the amplest recognition, in regard to all concerned, not merely of common Christianity but of common church-

manship. To adopt words that have already been used by the conference held in Oxford last January, all those who seek to negotiate reunion must be in entire accord in a 'common recognition of the fact that the denominations to which they severally belong are equally, as corporate groups, within the one Church of Christ; and that the efficacy of their ministrations is verified in the history of the Church.' 'All dealings between them should be conducted on the basis of this recognition.' Not only must no repudiation of the past, however adroitly veiled, be required from any of the non-Episcopal Churches, but their place in the divine ordering of history must be fully accorded to them and must be recognised in the terms of reunion.

"2. Care must be taken to gather together and preserve for the united Church all the permanent deposits of faith and order by which the various uniting denominations have been enriched, and through which they have severally made their respective contributions 'to the building up of the Body of Christ.' In this spirit the Lambeth Quadrilateral may well be accepted as the basis of a constructive effort which will seek to embody in a new declaration of faith and a reformed constitution all the living products of the Spirit working in and through the uniting communities.

"3. There must be no attempt to substitute uniformity for diversity, or to subject the united Church, or any parts of it, to autocratic rule. Reunion must stand for something other and less than fusion; for something other and more than federation. There must be a supreme order, and a common organisation that is sufficiently free and elastic, not merely to tolerate, but to encourage such freedom and diversity as may serve to carry on outstanding historic traditions and to satisfy different temperaments within the harmony and fellowship of the whole. Within such an order the appropriate place must be found for a reformed episcopate, a fully recognised presbyterate, a restored diaconate, and, not least of all, for the laity, with the rights of both sexes secured and 'liberty of prophesying' guaranteed.

"4. Finally, there must be the abrogation of the existing state establishment, in order that the united Church may have complete freedom and full power of shaping its life and action in the exercise of the amplest spiritual autonomy.

"Undoubtedly a strong body of opinion within the Anglican Church, representing what is broadest and most thoughtful in all its schools of thought, would accept, and even contend for, these principles in any scheme of reunion. Without them, it is safe to say that no considerable section of Nonconformists would consider any plan of reunion, however eagerly they may long for reunion if it be possible without sacrifice of what they regard as divine authority and of essential importance.

As we go to press this word comes from Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, secretary of the Commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order:

"We are assured of the presence at Geneva of representatives of at least forty different commissions, representing every part of the world, and more important than the number is the fact that in almost every case, each commission is sending those who are among its strongest men. It will be the most representative assemblage of Christians which has been held since the schism between the East and West."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION. By the late Principal James Denny, D. D. Author of "The Death of Christ," "Jesus and the Gospel," etc. The Cunningham Lectures for 1917. New York: George H. Doran Company. 339 pages.

Among the books that have appeared in recent years, this would be named in any group of a dozen of the best. Dr. Denny was the possessor of an unusual mind, and in the historical, critical and constructive discussion of the central truth of the New Testament he has left us a path of thinking that is surrounded by an exhilarating atmosphere of spiritual truth. The first problem facing us in a life so short and difficult as human life is to adjust ourselves to the laws and possibilities of that life. Our task is to know how to release our original and indefeasible unity with nature. Philosophers like Spinoza, Goethe, Kant and Wordsworth have thought with a great deal of attraction in this field. The reconciling power is in the historical Christ, not merely of Palestine two thousand years ago, but the historical Christ of now, for the Spirit of God not only makes Him present and eternal, but gives Him actual intercourse with the sinful. Here He appears as both minister and mediator of reconciliation. These facts are made plain in our realization that Jesus is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

The Church established its dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, but it has never established in the same sense the dogma of reconciliation. While there was much thinking on this subject through the centuries prior to the Reformation, it was not until after the Reformation, when dogmas in the old sense had become impossible, that the various branches of the Church began to form statements about the way of Christ's reconciling man to God, and especially about the meaning of His sufferings and death. Reconciliation was to be treated on the basis of experience. The more distressing the experience of sin, the more serious must be the problem of redemption and reconciliation. Consequently it has to do more with ethics than metaphysics.

The ideal is absolute faith in Christ, when neither the flesh nor the law can depress or discomfort the believer. There are instances in the life of Paul, as when he wrote the eighth chapter of Romans, that he seems to have realized it. Reconciliation to God is a blessing which is fully enjoyed in the present time on the abandoning of self to the sin-bearing love of Christ. The greatest need in human experience is reconciliation to God. Augustine was perfectly sure that he could not save himself from his sins; without divine help he was a lost man. Christ lived in our nature an absolutely sinless life. His sufferings had to do with sin and on that ground alone He achieved our reconciliation to God. His reconciliation is realized in human life, reaching out into the unseen and sustaining the hope of immortality. The closing sentence of the book

sums up in fine, practical fashion the elevating and satisfying presentation in these pages: "The Christian's faith in reconciliation does not find its full expression till it finds it here."

THE MENACE OF IMMORALITY IN CHURCH AND STATE. MESSAGES OF WRATH AND JUDGMENT. By Rev. John Roach Straton, D.D., Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York City, New York: George H. Doran Company. 253 pages.

This volume of fifteen sermons deals with those practices that are insidiously substituting immorality for morality. Dr. Straton is one of the fearless American preachers who is not afraid to condemn where condemnation should be given and uncover where sins have been covered under the guise of religion. He speaks in the terms of wrath and judgment regarding modern conditions. These sermons cover a period of two years, not being delivered in a series but periodically as the occasion demanded. His merciless arraignment of worldly practices in the Church is a healthy call at an opportune time.

RELIGION AMONG AMERICAN MEN: AS REVEALED BY A STUDY OF CONDITIONS IN THE ARMY. Issued by The Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Association Press, New York, 1920.

The work published under the above title is more than a book. It is the constructive report of a widespread and thoroughgoing investigation concerning the status of religion among American men as reflected by the attitudes of the American soldier. It is the first of a series of such studies being prepared by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, a committee made up of representative men and women of the various Protestant Churches and appointed "to consider the state of religion as revealed or affected by the war, with special reference to the duty and opportunity of the Churches, and to prepare these findings for submission to the Churches."

The Report deals with all phases of the Church's problem as reflected in the attitude of men of the army toward religion and the Church. Necessarily it gives much space to the Church's chief problem; namely, that of division and reunion. In this connection the findings of the Committee are unanimous and emphatic. Indifference to denominationalism is an outstanding fact. "The soldier knew very little about doctrinal differences between Churches and cared less. It seemed senseless to him that the Protestant Church should be divided into denominations."

Among the chaplains there was found a real desire for unity and the belief in the possibility of union; in fact, a large proportion of the chaplains interviewed regarded unity as the end most desirable. Their general attitude is seen in the following reply to the questionnaire sent out:

"It is time that the Church put a stop to its competition and strife among denominations and applied itself definitely and unreservedly to ministering to the deep social and religious needs of mankind."



"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

OCTOBER, 1920

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK



ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. X.

OCTOBER, 1920

No. 2

CONTENTS

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE	89
SCOTTISH CHURCH REUNION	94
By Robert Forgan	
PRIEST OR PROPHET? A QUESTION FOR THE DAY . . .	105
By W. H. Griffith Thomas	
A PILGRIMAGE TOWARDS UNITY	117
By Charles H. Brent	
THE DISCIPLES' PROGRAMME FOR UNION	121
By George W. Brown	
EDITORIAL:	
THREE OUTSTANDING CONFERENCES	129
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY .	140
LETTER TO THE EDITOR	156
BOOK REVIEWS	158

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

QUADRENNIAL meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Boston, Mass., Dec. 1-6, 1920. Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d Street, New York City, Secretary.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE announces the Annual Universal Week of Prayer, Jan. 2-8, 1921. Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Square, London, General Secretary.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, some time in 1921. Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Secretary.

UNIVERSAL CONFERENCE OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ON LIFE AND WORK, two or three years hence. Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d Street, New York City, Provisional Secretary.

WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, time and place unnamed. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, Secretary.

AT THE instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Pentecost Sunday has been named primarily as the day for special sermons on Christian unity in all Churches, along with prayers to that end. Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., Secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

THANKSGIVING:

FOR the conferences dealing with Christian unity held in various parts of the world, especially those in Switzerland.

FOR the opportunity of facing great problems in the life of the Church.

FOR the kindly approach of Christians toward each other.

FOR the dawn of hope in the discovery of better understanding among Christians.

FOR the promise that He will never leave us nor forsake us.

PRAYER:

O LORD, the one Father whom all Thy children confess, we beseech Thee for Thy church that its life may be more truly one life as its faith is one faith. We would confess the failure and weakness of the church through its divisions and its sectarianism. In a world whose many and grave needs demand a united body for Thy spirit to dwell in, we own in humility and penitence the unworthiness of the body we offer Thee. Thrust our hearts through with the shame of our divisions. Smite our consciences with the guilt of hindering Thy Spirit by our party pride and rivalry and strife. Show us how useless and how false are our sectarian claims. How meaningless must they seem to Thee, O Lord!

Call us all, we beseech Thee, from our separate altars, these wayside shrines where now we tarry—call us away from them to the one altar where our hearts find true peace. We do not wish to come to Thee by any partisan path, in any private way, but we would approach Thee by the common road whereon all men of simple faith seek Thy presence. Deliver us from those over-refinements of thought which enslave us and obscure from our sight the common human way. When we stand at Thine august altar, Thou God of the burly realities, how unreal and hollow seem those nice distinctions by which we separate ourselves from our brothers! Deliver us from this narrowing pride of opinion, this microscopic and selfish view of truth and life and of Thee. Teach us the spiritual art of finding agreements with those from whom we differ, and make us glad to work and worship with all who seek in sincerity to do the will of God.

Quicken in all the churches the sense of their common share in the one church of Christ. Pour out Thy favor upon all the efforts now being made to bring Thy followers of many names closer together in acquaintance, in sympathy, in fellowship and in common work. By this workaday and open pathway lead us out of the follies into which our creeds have lured us, and bring us at last and speedily into the unity of spirit and of body for which our Saviour prayed. It is in his name we ask it.—Amen.

—*The Christian Century.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL
RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMAN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church,
Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Canon of Westminster, London, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price \$2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF
THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
FOR JULY, 1920

EDITORIAL:

THE SWITZERLAND CONFERENCES OF THIS SUMMER	9
NOTES AND COMMENTS	12
UNITY IN THE MISSION FIELD. ROBERT E. SPEER	16
PRESENT POSSIBILITIES AND FUTURE STEPS TO- WARDS UNITY. T. J. PULVERTAFT	26
PAUL'S PLAN FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY. JOHN B. COWDEN	33
SOME FALLACIES CONCERNING CHURCH UNITY AND A HOPEFUL PLAN. ROBERT WESTLY PEACH	49
SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING CONFERENCES BE- TWEEN THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS AND CONGREGATIONALISTS	56
CHRISTIAN UNITY IN AUSTRALIA. GEORGE HALL	60
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY	63
BOOK REVIEWS	79

A PRAYER FOR UNITY

O LORD, we thank thee that in spite of our divisions, Thou hast loved us and art ever seeking to make Thyself so known to us that we may love each other fervently with pure minds and true hearts. Shine thou upon us that we may have light enough to find the way to each other, for there is a path of brotherhood among men as sure as there are paths for the stars. Forgive us in that we have found the upper path, but are still stumbling across the earth in search of a path which thou didst make of old and which in our blindness we know not of. Guide us, O Lord, that our footsteps may honor thee, Whose we are and Whom we serve. Amen.

THE WAY TO UNITY

No mortal need fancy that he shall have the honour of devising either the plan of uniting Christians into one holy band of zealous coöperation, or of converting Jews and Gentiles to the faith that Jesus is that seed in Whom all the families of the earth are yet to be blessed. The plan is divine. It is ordained by God; and, better still, it is already revealed. Is any one impatient to hear it? Let him again read the intercessions of the Lord Messiah in the seventeenth chapter of John. Let him then examine the two following propositions, and say whether these do not express heaven's own scheme of augmenting and conserving the Body of Christ. Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and coöperation of Christians. Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the Apostles' teaching or testimony. Or does he choose to express the plan of the Self-Existent in other words? Then he may change the order, and say—The Testimony of the Apostles is the only and all-sufficient means of uniting all Christians. The union of Christians with the Apostles' testimony is all-sufficient and alone sufficient to the conversion of the world. Neither truth alone nor union alone is sufficient to subdue the unbelieving nations; but truth and union combined are omnipotent. They are omnipotent, for God is in them and with them, and has consecrated and blessed them for this very purpose.—*Alexander Campbell.*

IF a man isolates himself from other Christians on the theory that he is better than others personally or theologically, pray for that man, for he has a plague that is the most deadly disease in the world.

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

FROM THE BISHOPS ASSEMBLED IN THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1920

WE, archbishops, bishops metropolitan, and other bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, in conference assembled, realizing the responsibility which rests upon us at this time, and sensible of the sympathy and the prayers of many, both within and without our own communion, make this appeal to all Christian people.

We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.

I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.

II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affini-

ties, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made

serviceable to the whole body of Christ. Within this unity Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

V. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

VI. We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

VII. May we not reasonably claim that the episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those communions which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify

the claim which we make on behalf of the episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

VIII. We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, Whose call led us all to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same.

IX. The spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world.

We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

SCOTTISH CHURCH REUNION

BY REV. ROBERT FORGAN, D.D., Minister United Free Church,
Aberdeen, Scotland

THE specific subject of this paper is the movement towards union between the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland. This is not the occasion on which to discuss the duty or desirability of Church union in the abstract, or to enlarge upon the high spiritual aspects of the subject. Let it suffice to say in one word that while an ecclesiastically engineered amalgamation of Church machinery might do very little for the real religious good of Scotland, a genuine incorporating union of the two Churches concerned, if carried through in an earnest and sympathetic spirit, ought surely to result in a great quickening of the religious zeal and the spiritual life of our Scottish people. Taking that for granted, I propose to come to close quarters at once with the actual movement towards union about which I am to write in these brief pages. First of all, I shall briefly set forth the object, origin, and course of the movement, and then second, I shall try to state as exactly as possible the position which the movement has now reached.

The object of the movement has from the first been severely practical. Every step taken has had in view the removal of the main causes which at present keep the two Churches apart in the hope of preparing the way for the reunion of Presbyterianism in Scotland. It is essential to remember this practical aim, otherwise we may all too easily find ourselves bogged and befogged in a discussion of theoretical abstractions. We cannot indeed avoid referring to certain historical fundamental principles. These have to be dealt with, but always with the practical object of the movement in full view.

The origin of the movement dates from the "Church crisis" of our United Free Church, which followed upon

the House of Lords' judgment in the Church Case in 1904. That judgment, though not so designed, seriously affected by implication the doctrinal position of the Church of Scotland. And one immediate result was that in the Act of Parliament passed to put right the wrong done to the United Free Church, occasion was taken to insert a clause empowering the Church of Scotland to adjust its relation to the Confession of Faith by changing the formula of subscription. But that was not all. Lord Balfour of Burleigh has publicly stated that from the day of the House of Lords' judgment he felt that a union of the Churches would be the result. It is one more illustration of the fine irony of Providence that Lord Halsbury's "smashing blow to Non-conformity," as he called it, should first render the Established Church doctrinally restive and then lead to proposals for union on terms which involve the absolute setting aside of the positions he laid down.

In 1906 came our United Free Church Declaration of Spiritual Independence. With this declaration very many in the Church of Scotland sympathised. They disliked the position of antiquated exclusiveness assigned to them by the law as interpreted by Lord Halsbury. They felt it was not true that they were the only body in Scotland entitled to be regarded as a Church. To their credit, they perceived that the situation was intolerable. Something had to be done. The more they reflected, the more clearly they recognized the value of the great principle of spiritual freedom for which we of the United Free Church had so long fought and so often suffered. The upshot was a growing desire that the two Scottish Churches should draw together. Thus the movement originated. Now we come to the course it has followed.

The first proposal made by the Church of Scotland in 1908 was that the two Churches should appoint committees to confer on possible methods of coöperation. To

this proposal the United Free Church replied that while informal coöperation might be possible, officially organised coöperation on equal terms seemed impracticable, and suggested that, instead, the two Churches ought to appoint committees to enter upon unrestricted conference regarding the main causes which keep the Churches apart in the hope of thereby promoting the reunion of Scottish Presbyterianism. This suggestion the Church of Scotland accepted, and in 1909, the two committees were appointed. The members were largely strangers to each other, and for a time progress was slow; but by and by a spirit of mutual confidence arose, and on both sides an educative process was entered upon. A profound impression was produced by the results of a careful investigation of the religious condition of the country. A report and a map, largely prepared by Dr. Henderson, showed that where the population was greatest, i. e., in the belt of country between Edinburgh and Glasgow, there the Church provision was least, while in other parts of the country where the population was least, there the Church provision was greatest. The absolute moral necessity for a vast re-adjustment of agencies and resources was demonstrated, and the urgent desirability for a union of the Churches with this practical object in view was tremendously reinforced. The task even for a reunited Church was seen to be a formidable one, but the religious future of Scotland demanded that it should be faced.

Thus more than ever convinced of the need and the duty of union, our friends of the Church of Scotland now made a disconcerting discovery. By the terms of their connection with the State, they found themselves unable to carry through any effective union. They had not sufficient power of independent action. They could not change their methods or transfer their resources. By the sheer necessities of the situation they were accord-

ingly compelled to reconsider their relation to the State. At this stage, a great day of hope dawned when at a meeting of the two committees Dr. Wallace Williamson, then simply a private, though, of course, an influential member, bravely and frankly declared that he was no longer to be hampered by shibboleths, or by controversial terms such as establishment or disestablishment, but was out to discover the right relation between Church and State, and to go in for that, whatever might be the cost.

Soon after this there appeared in 1912 the epoch-making "Memorandum" of the Procurator, Christopher Johnston, (now Lord Sands). This statesmanlike memorandum outlined a course of procedure which seemed to point in the direction of a possible solution of the main difficulties which had been found to block the way.

The principal proposal was that the Church of Scotland should draw up certain Articles declaratory of its constitution in matters spiritual, and get these recognised by Parliament as lawful, because it was clear that only then would the Church of Scotland be in a position to enter with free hands into negotiations for a possible union.

In response to this memorandum, we of the United Free Church naturally requested to see a draft of the Articles in this proposed constitution. This draft the committee of the Church of Scotland set itself to prepare, frankly welcoming help from our committee and more especially in an informal way from some of our leading members. The avowed object, I repeat once more, was the practical one of placing the Church of Scotland in a position in which it would be free to enter on negotiations for union in an honourable way, not by one Church absorbing the other, but by each acting in its corporate capacity and so securing a union on terms

of equality as Churches. In May, 1914, a draft of the Articles was presented to the General Assembly, which ordered them to be sent down to presbyteries for discussion. But the war broke out in August, and the presbyteries found themselves too preoccupied; and for several years no further progress was made except that in many parts of the country ministers and congregations of both Churches were drawn together in mutual helpfulness and coöperation by the exigencies of the situation such as the absence of ministers as chaplains and the like. At length, however, the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in 1918, instructed their committee to resume its work and to report on the whole matter in 1919. Last May this was done, and the draft constitution was sent down to presbyteries for their approval or otherwise as a basis of approach to the Government with a view to ascertaining whether facilities would be given for an Enabling Bill. The presbyteries were instructed to report to the Commission of the Assembly, and did so last December. As 88 per cent of the presbyteries signified their approval, the Commission, as empowered by the Assembly, authorised the committee to approach the Government and reported the result to the Assembly in May, 1920.

Having thus set forth the object, origin and course of the movement towards union, I come now to say something of its present position. And as I have already had to indicate the position of the Church of Scotland so far, I must now deal more particularly with the position of the United Free Church. Where, then, does our Church stand in relation to all these doings on the part of the Church of Scotland? We have neither been idle spectators nor neutrals. Our committee has gladly and sympathetically given all the help in its power, directly and indirectly, formally and informally, and on the part of some members very confidentially. But let us not for-

get that we have necessarily had to wait, and are still waiting, until the Church of Scotland gets into a position in which it will be free to consider a plan of union and give actual and practical effect to any plan of which they and we may together finally approve. Suppose, however, that the proposed Enabling Bill should be passed, what will follow? The turn of the United Free Church will then have come for making a momentous decision. The Church of Scotland will then have it in its power to adopt these Articles as declaring its constitution in matters spiritual. Can we then regard it as a Church with which we can hopefully enter into negotiations for an incorporating union?

Before venturing to suggest how our Church should answer that momentous question, let me clear the ground a little by referring here to two subordinate points. First, what about consulting our kirk sessions and congregations? Our General Assembly has already twice, if not three times, sent down our committee's reports on this important matter and invited and received expressions of opinion from presbyteries, sessions, and congregations. And though I have no formal decision to go by, I fully expect that further expressions of opinion will be similarly invited; and for myself, I should like every session and congregation to be given the opportunity of formally voting "Yes" or "No" on the question of union before the presbyteries and the Assembly take the final constitutional decision in the matter.

The second point is a point of strategic or tactical importance. It is not very commonly known, but the Church of Scotland has plainly stated that it is not formally to adopt the Articles or send them down under the Barrier Act for adoption except as part and parcel of a scheme of union. The Enabling Act of Parliament will leave the Church free to adopt or not adopt these Articles as it sees fit. From the point of view of spiritual free-

dom, this is as it should be, for such Articles ought not to be imposed or even ratified or confirmed by Parliament. It is enough that they be recognised by Parliament as "lawful." But observe what this involves. If negotiations were entered on and broke down over any matter, say, over the disposal of the endowments, then the Church of Scotland intends to fall back on its present position and let the Articles become a dead letter. Some critical persons say that this will give the Church of Scotland a certain leverage in dealing with us. But as against that, it seems to me sufficient to point out that it will not be easy for the Church of Scotland, after going to Parliament for liberty to adopt these Articles, lightly to turn round and say they won't make any use of them. That would put them in a very unfavourable position in the eyes of the nation. So we may set aside all unworthy suspicions that the dice are to be loaded against us. Both Churches ought to negotiate the plan of union unhampered by any fear of public opinion, and trust to the sense of honour in each Church not to take any unworthy advantage in the interval.

After these digressions, I now come back to the one great question which lies before our United Free Church—Are we prepared to unite, or is there any fundamental principle forbidding our Church to unite, with a Church possessing, or willing to adopt these Articles as the prevailing and over-ruling element in its constitution? Assuming our Church's objections to the present constitution of the Church of Scotland to be valid, are those objections removed by these Articles? There can be no question that our Church of Scotland friends believe honestly that they have set forth a position on which we should be able to meet them. And it is not a position of compromise. To my mind there is absolutely no element of compromise in their proposals. The objections of the United Free Church to the present constitution of

the Established Church gather round two matters of vast importance—you may call them principles, if you like. One is the matter of spiritual freedom, the other is the matter of State endowments. Both sections of our United Free Church have contended all through their separate history for spiritual freedom; and they have also more than once suffered grievous material loss rather than accept State support under conditions which in their view hampered or destroyed that spiritual freedom which they cherished as above all price. Both matters, therefore, raise the question of the relation between Church and State. And it follows that if that relation can be so changed as to vindicate, preserve, and maintain the Church's spiritual freedom, then our objections vanish, or ought to vanish.

Now, I believe it is universally granted that the inherent spiritual freedom of the Church as a Church of Christ is adequately claimed and set forth in the Articles. These Articles frankly and unmistakably adopt what was the position of the fathers of the Secession and of the Evangelical party in the Established Church as against the Erastians in the Ten Years' Conflict before the Disruption of 1843. If Parliament recognises the present Established Church to be still the Church of Scotland with the spiritual liberties and powers claimed in these Articles, we of the United Free Church are bound to confess that, so far at least, the way has been cleared for entering upon negotiations for union. At the same time, it ought to be borne in mind that when negotiations are entered on, our Church's relation to these Articles and the exact position which these Articles are to hold in the reunited Church will still remain open for adjustment. And it ought also to be added here that the liberties and powers of action claimed in the Articles with reference to changes in administration, mode of electing ministers, setting up of new charges, and giving

ministers seats in the Church courts, transfer of resources, and the like are not to remain so many mere good words, but are to be exercised and acted upon. Some of our leaders quite recently felt certain misgivings lest possible misunderstandings on these points should break out in the reunited Church, and a whole series of most testing questions were asked, with the result that our Church of Scotland friends were found to be quite prepared for the most drastic application of the powers and liberties claimed in the Articles.

And now, what of the other matter—the State endowments? Well, all through the old Disestablishment campaign, the contention was that these endowments were national property, and as such ought to be disposed of by Parliament. And what do we find to-day? The Church of Scotland is ready to agree that a Parliamentary Commission shall be set up for the express purpose of disposing once for all of these national endowments, provided only that they are not to be secularised, but shall be applied for “pious uses.” And still further they apparently agree also to the position we of the United Free Church have taken up in this matter, viz., that when this Parliamentary Commission has done its work, the endowments turned into money from commuted teinds and the like and paid over in satisfaction of the personal interests of ministers and of congregations (for surely congregations have pecuniary rights as well as ministers), shall become the private property of the Church of Scotland in the same sense and to the same effect as the property of the United Free Church is its private property. And mark what will be the consequence of this: Not one vestige of State control over any part of the Church’s property will be left.

How precisely a Parliamentary Commission will act, how much or how little it will assign to the Church, and how much or how little to other “pious uses,” such as education or hospitals or district nursing, it will not be

in the power of either Church, as a Church, to determine. Church members, as citizens and voters, may approve or disapprove, but that will be all.

For the rest, if the Church with which our Church is asked to unite possesses all its property on the same terms as we possess ours, then it would seem to follow that even the keenest voluntary can have nothing to say.

One other aspect of this matter, however, still requires to be referred to. In what position will a reunited Church of Scotland, possessing complete spiritual freedom and absolute private ownership of its property, stand towards the State? Will it still be an Established Church? Or will it have been disestablished and more or less disendowed? The answer is that it will be the Church of Scotland recognised as such by the State, but no longer established on the old disabling conditions nor holding endowments subject to any special State control. Its historic identity will be formally and officially recognised and declared by Parliament as remaining undisturbed notwithstanding these sweeping changes in its constitution, and it will continue to be and to act as the Church of Scotland in all the public life of the nation. All ancient statutes inconsistent with the Articles will stand repealed; but the statutory relation of the Church to the State will not be violently ruptured, as it would be by a formal Act of Disestablishment. All power of State interference will have gone, but the historic tie will remain, purified from every element of Erastianism which in the past has poisoned the relationship to the injury of the State quite as much as to the injury of the Church. Remember always in this connection that if the proposed union is carried out, it is to be the act of the two Churches on terms determined solely by themselves, without even being so much as reported to Parliament. And how a United Church so set up can be called a State institution or an Established Church in the old sense, I for my part am unable to see.

Still further, it has been expressly laid down that no special position of privilege for the United Church will remain of a kind that would either depress the position of other Churches in the land or deny their right to be regarded by the law as Churches. A statutory disclaimer to this effect has been promised.

The one serious question about which some may still require fuller satisfaction is how much precisely may be involved in the statutory relation of the Church to the State which is to remain. The difficulty is that in the ancient statutes of the Realm of Scotland there are hundreds of references to the kirk, many of them merely incidental, and many more mixed up with other legislative matters, so that it would be a task passing the wit or skill of man to disentangle and repeal every detail which may now be deemed objectionable. It is conceivable that some ingenious Lord Halsbury of the future might attempt to find in the terms of one of these statutes ground upon which the State might still interfere with the Church's spiritual freedom. But against such a contingency it is to be expressly provided in the Enabling Act that in all questions of construing or interpreting the ancient statutes the new Articles are to prevail and that provision seems to offer as full security as is humanly possible.

For the rest, some risks must be run, if any changes at all are ever to be made either in Church or State. And in view of the extraordinary, and, I will add, the noble advance towards our position made by the Church of Scotland as it is at present constituted, it seems to me that our Church is being asked to take by far the smaller risk in the matter. They have done a bold thing, and it requires much less courage on our part to respond to their offer and grasp the hand they hold out to us. May God give to both Churches the vision and the faith without which nothing great or good can ever be achieved.

PRIEST OR PROPHET? A QUESTION FOR THE DAY

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Wycliffe College, Episcopal, Toronto

IN the Old Testament, and also in the New, the fact of a "ministry" is clearly recorded. In the former the ministry consists chiefly of two orders or classes of men—the priests and the prophets, each with its own sphere more or less clearly defined, and with a work of great importance and absolute necessity, because of divine appointment.

The essence of the priesthood was the representation of man to God; the essence of the prophetic office was the representation of God to man. Anything else done by priest or prophet was accidental and additional, and not a necessary part of his office. The essential work of the priest was expressed in sacrifice and intercession, and may be summed up in the word "mediator." The essential work of the prophet was expressed in revelation and instruction, and may be summed up in the word "ambassador." The priesthood meant propitiation; the prophetic office, revelation. The priest was concerned with the way of man to God; the prophet with the will of God to man. The two offices were thus complementary and, together, fulfilled all the requirements of the relationship between God and man.

The ministry of the New Testament is equally clear and undoubted, but with certain great and notable differences. There is absolutely nothing about a special order or class of men called priests. The only priesthood, apart from the Lord's, is the spiritual priesthood of all believers. There is, however, much that answers to the essential ministry of the Old Testament prophet, but with this difference, that ministry in the New Testament is not confined to any one class of believers, it is the privilege and duty of all. Diversities of gifts in that

ministry there are most assuredly, but ministry generally and of some kind is for all. Indeed, the various gifts are for the express purpose of "equipping the saints for their work of ministering" (Eph. 4:12, Greek and R. V.).

Whether, then, we think of the ministry of the priest or of the prophet, it is clear from the New Testament that there is no class of believers to which spiritual functions exclusively belong as of absolute and divine appointment. What is required for "decency and order" is quite another question, and though important and essential, is assuredly secondary to the above-named fundamental principle of the New Testament.

From these differences between the Old and New Testaments the subject of this paper emerges, viz., "The Silence of the New Testament as to any Special Order of Priests and Its Insistence on the Ministry of the Word."

THE SILENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS TO ANY SPECIAL ORDER OF PRIESTS

This silence is a simple fact. There are twenty-seven books, and not a single reference can be found to a special human priesthood. But this conveys only a little of the strength of the evidence. The New Testament is not so much a volume as a library, and its evidence consists of several independent parts, and has a cumulative force. Let us take seven of these representative and distinctive parts and notice the result. (a) There are the instructions of our Lord to His disciples and apostles in the four Gospels, but not a word about a special priesthood. (b) There is the first book of general Church history, the Acts of the Apostles, but not a hint of such a priesthood. (c) There is the first detailed picture of one particular Apostolic Church in the Epistles to the Corinthians, but not a sign of any such priest-

hood. (d) There are the two great doctrinal Epistles for Gentile Christians, Romans and Ephesians, but no instruction whatever as to such a priesthood. (e) There is the great doctrinal Epistle for Jewish Christians, Hebrews, but nothing in it except our Lord's priesthood. (f) There are the three Epistles of pastoral and ecclesiastical instructions, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, but not a word of any special priesthood. (g) There are the mature writings of the two great Apostles of the Circumcision, St. Peter and St. John, but no trace whatever of this priesthood. This evidence taken separately in its parts is striking, but taken as a whole it is cumulative and absolutely overwhelming.

This silence is a striking fact. Here twenty-seven books, covering a period of at least forty to fifty years, referring to the foundation and early history of the Church amid differences of place, country, race, capacity, and conditions of life. Yet there is no provision for a special order of priesthood. It is also a striking silence, because (with one possible exception) all the writers were Jews, and, as such, steeped in sacerdotal ideas, language, and associations from their earliest childhood. The Apostles use sacrificial and sacerdotal language on several occasions to describe certain elements and aspects of the Gospel, notably, St. Paul in Romans 15:16, where he speaks of his preaching as his sacred and sacrificial service, and his Gentile converts as his sacrificial offering. But this, as the whole context shows, is manifestly spiritual and symbolical in meaning, and is at once descriptive and illustrative of his work as a "prophet" or preacher of the Gospel. But not one of them ever used the word a sacrificing priest, to distinguish a Christian minister from a layman. How can we account for the avoidance of this familiar term?

Bishop Westcott is recorded to have observed in some of his lectures at Cambridge that this avoidance was the

nearest approach he knew to verbal inspiration. Some of us would venture to go a step further, and claim it as an unmistakable example of the superintending control of the Holy Ghost in the composition of the Scriptures. Humanly speaking, the chances against avoiding the use of *ιερείς* in this connection are as ten thousand to one. Indeed, we may almost say that to refuse to explain it by the guiding of the Holy Ghost is to require for its explanation what is virtually a miracle of human thought, foresight, and mutual pre-arrangement among several writers.

If it be said that the question is one not of words but of things, we reply with Bishop Lightfoot, "This is undeniable; but words express things, and the silence of the Apostles still requires an explanation" (*Philippians*, Essays, p. 264). Neither the word nor the thing can be discovered in the New Testament.

This silence is a significant fact. It is what Bishop Lightfoot calls "the eloquent silence of the Apostolic writings" (*Ut supra*, p. 182). There is no mention because there is no place for it and no need of it in the New Testament. In the Jewish economy a mediatorial priesthood was necessary, because of alienation from God, because sin was not put away, because the way to God was not open. But now sin has been put away, the way into the holiest is manifest, and for this Christ, our divine Priest, is all. This the burden of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the one and only priesthood, inviolable, undelegated *ἀναραβατον*, (Heb. 7:24), of our Lord. Christ's priesthood is unique, perfect, and permanent; and as long as He is Priest there is no room for and no need of any other mediator.

This silence as to a special human priesthood shows that such a priesthood is irreconcilable with the letter and spirit of Apostolic Christianity. In this respect "Christianity stands apart from all the other religions."

It is the "characteristic distinction of Christianity" (Lightfoot, *ut supra*, p. 182) to have no such provision. Where there is no repeated offering, there is no need of an altar; where there is no altar, there is no sacrifice; where there is no sacrifice, there is, there can be, no priest. The benefits of the sacrifice once for all offered are now being continually bestowed by Christ and appropriated by the penitent believer without any human mediator, because "the kingdom of Christ * * * has no sacerdotal system" (Lightfoot, p. 181).

Of late, however, the argument has been frequently used that ministerial priesthood, or the priesthood of the ministry, is only the universal priesthood of believers expressed through their representatives, that as the human body acts through its members, so the Church as the Body of Christ acts through the ministry as its instruments and that, consequently, when the "priest" is exercising his ministerial functions, it is really the Church acting through him.

To this line of argument the answer seems clear:—
 (1) There is an entire silence in the New Testament as to this special, and, as it were, localized priesthood. Surely if the ministry had been regarded as exercising a priesthood distinguishable from the priesthood of all believers, or regarded as the priesthood of the Church specialized, it would have been necessary to show that this ministerial priesthood existed in the Christian Church. Yet there are no priestly functions associated with the Christian ministry as such in the New Testament. The priesthood of all believers is inherent in their relation to Christ. This is the divine warrant for it and there is no such warrant for any narrower or modified form of it.

(2) Is it not at least unsafe, even if not perilous, to base such a novel and far-reaching claim on a metaphor, the figure of the human body?

(3) The Scriptural use of this metaphor never differentiates between the spiritual body and its instruments, but only between members and members.

(4) The modern use of the metaphor now in question proves too much, for while in the natural body *certain members alone* can act and "minister" in certain ways, as the hand does in one way and the foot in another, in the Scripture idea of the Body of Christ *each member* has real "priestly" functions. "That which every joint supplieth" (Eph. 4:16). These differences of function are only of degree, not of kind, and do not constitute the ministry a special and localized priesthood, a position which would involve a difference of kind.

(5) This idea of a ministerial priesthood as expressive of the universal priesthood is a novel and significant departure from the older and still generally accepted idea of the sacerdotalism of the Christian ministry. It represents an almost entire shifting of the ground. The prevalent conception of the priesthood of the ministry has been that of an order of men in direct touch with Christ, and, as such, acting *on* the body rather than *for* it. But the new use of the metaphor really implies that the instruments act *for* the body and *through* the body, in the sense of not being *immediately* in contact with the Head. The older sacerdotalism maintains that the priesthood receives and represents "an attribute of grace distinct from" that received by the Church, "by virtue of which grace, men are brought into such relationship with God that through this instrumentality they obtain the promised blessings of the covenant under which they live" (Canon T. T. Carter, *On the Priesthood*, p. 99). But this view involves much more than a concentration of the priesthood of the whole of the Church in a part of it. It represents another line of grace different from the general one in kind as well as in degree. Yet Scripture knows nothing of two separate lines of grace, one from

the Head direct to the Church, and the other from the Head to the ministry.

The older and nearer views of the priestly character of the ministry are therefore incompatible, and sacerdotalists cannot have both. It is impossible on any true analogy to distinguish between the spiritual body and its ministerial organs in such a way as to make the organs the *instruments* of the body, according to the new view, and yet in *authority over it*, according to the old view. Upholders of ministerial priesthood must choose between these positions, though for neither of them is there any warrant or authority in the Word of God.

(6) The functions of the Christian ministry, as such, and considered in themselves, are those of a personal medium, not of a priestly mediator; they are prophetic, not priestly, they are exercised on behalf of Christ rather than on behalf of the Church, and represent the Head rather than the Body. And even so far as they may be said in certain aspects to represent the Church, the functions are "representative and not vicarial" (Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 267). In short, the essential idea of the ministry is *διακονία*, not *ιεράτευμα*, service, not sacerdotalism, and it can never be too frequently asserted that the fundamental conception of the Christian ministry is that it represents God to the Church rather than the Church to God, that it is prophetic and not priestly.

(7) It is scarcely too much to say that this new idea or application of "ministerial priesthood" is the refuge of men who have been driven from the older position by the logic of Scripture truth concerning the priesthood of all believers, the uniqueness of our Lord's priesthood and the entire absence of any essentially sacerdotal functions (such as offering sacrifice) from the New Testament conception of the Christian minister. In so far, therefore, as the new view implies a modification of, or rather a

departure from the older sacerdotal view, it may be welcomed as at least a significant change, but it cannot be accepted as a means of bringing back and preserving the old view. As already stated, the two positions are incompatible, and if the new be true the old was false. But, in fact, neither the new nor the old view is Scriptural, and it may be stated fearlessly that there is no function or office of the Christian *priesthood* which cannot be exercised by any and every individual believer in Christ of either sex, wherever and whatever they may be. Differences of function in the Christian *ministry* there are, but in the Christian *priesthood* there are not. So we return to our point and call renewed attention to the simple, striking and significant silence of the New Testament as to any new and special order of priests.

Side by side with this silence as to any new order of priests we find

THE INSISTENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ON THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD

The New Testament emphasizes the nature of the ministry.—The ministry of the New Testament is twofold, for evangelization and edification: the ministry to the sinner and to the saint. There are at least seven series of titles associated with the ministry which show the character and necessity of it in the Church. The minister is a herald (Κήρυξ and cognates), a messenger of good news (εὐαγγελιστής and cognates), a witness (μάρτυς and cognates), an ambassador (Πρεσβεύω), a servant (διάκονος and cognates), a shepherd (Ποιμήν, οἰκονόμος, and cognates), and a teacher (διδάσκαλος, Προφήτης, and cognates). The variety and fulness of reference plainly show the paramount importance placed on the ministry of the Word.

The New Testament emphasizes the message of the ministry.—There are two phrases that sum up this message,

one referring chiefly to its relation to God and the other to its relation to man. "The Word" is the message as it expresses the mind of God. "The Gospel" is the message as it describes its destination for and acceptableness to man. Associated with "the Word" we find at least seven series of titles of the message: The Word of God, the Word of Christ, the Word of the Lord, the Word of reconciliation, the Word of salvation, the Word of grace, the Word of righteousness, the Word of truth, the Word of life. There are also seven series connected with "the Gospel": The Gospel of God, the Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of the grace of God, the Gospel of salvation, the Gospel of peace, the Gospel of the kingdom, the Gospel of the glory of God.

These various aspects, so clear, so full, so important, may be all summed up in three well-known passages: "It is I"; "It is finished"; "It is written." The Person of Christ, the Work of Christ, the Word of Christ. Salvation provided, wrought, and assured. This is essentially the complete yet remarkably varied message of the ministry of Christianity.

The New Testament emphasizes the purpose of the ministry.—The ministry of the Word is intended to bring God and man face to face—God revealing, man responding. It claims to do for man all that he needs or can need. Regeneration, sanctification, edification, glorification, are all associated with the Word of God, and at every step of the Christian life the ministry of that Word finds its place and power.

This purpose becomes realized in the response of man through faith. The Word of God and faith are correlatives, and faith is emphasized in the New Testament because it is the only, as it is the adequate, response to the revelation of God. Faith brings the soul into direct contact with God, and the result is "righteousness through faith." The Gospel is the power of God unto

salvation, because in it is revealed God's righteousness from faith to faith, having faith as its correlative and channel from first to last (Rom. 1:16, 17). Faith responds to God's Word and appropriates Christ as God's righteousness "for us" for justification, and God's righteousness "in us" for sanctification.

This is the New Testament "ministry of the Word," and in all it is ministerial and instrumental, not mediatorial and vicarious. Who are we but ministers through whom men "believe"? And this ministry is a permanent element. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel." Among St. Paul's concluding exhortations was, "Preach the Word." St. Peter's last teaching emphasizes the Word of God. St. John's closing writings exhort to "abiding in the Truth." The permanent ministry of the Word is a threefold guarantee to the Church.

It is a guarantee of the purity of the Church. Whenever it has been neglected, the course of the Church has been deflected; and whenever, as at the Reformation, this has been predominant, her purity has been prominent. This is the explanation of every backsliding, the secret of every recovery. There must ever be in this sense "a reversion to type."

It is a guarantee of the progress of the Church. Whenever it has been honored, there has been extension; whenever it has been neglected, stagnation. Missionary work at home and abroad finds its definite trend and full impetus in the ministry of the Word.

It is a guarantee of the power of the Church. As a protection against all foes and for the good of all friends, let us honor the ministry of the Word. There is no weapon Rome fears more than the Word of God. It was with a sure spiritual perception that Luther emphasized justification by faith as the *articulus aut stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, and it is with an equally sure instinct from another standpoint that Rome sees in this doctrine

her most powerful enemy, and assails it with the most virulent opposition. Not because of the supposed danger to morality through "Solifidianism," but, as Litton well says, because it cuts at the root of all her priestly power, Rome wages warfare against justification by faith.

This truth brings the soul into direct, conscious, blessed, satisfying contact and union with Christ, and thereby dispenses at once and forever with a human mediator. Christ is thereby present and no longer merely represented.

The ministry of the Word, too, is our great power against Neo-Anglicanism. In proportion as the sacerdotal element goes up, the ministry of the Word goes down. Exalt the priest and you depose the teacher, for the inherent tendency of Sacerdotalism is directly opposed to that of the preaching and teaching ministry of the Word of God. Let our people be saturated with the truth of Holy Scripture, and they will find in it their power against all Sacerdotalism.

The ministry of the Word is also our power against the worldliness of the Church and congregation. Let the standard of the Word be uplifted and pressed on heart and conscience, and the worldly devices and elements in our Church life will fall away and die. The message of the Word for holiness of heart and life will soon settle questionable methods of Church finance, Church life, and Church work. And all this will be so because of its power to "edify" the believer. More and better Bible classes, more expository teaching in our sermons, more individual meditation and study and teaching of the Word will soon have its blessed effects in the individual and congregation life.

Let us, therefore, honor the Word of God. Honor it in the soul, in the home, in the study, in the pulpit, in the congregation, in the college, in the university, in the na-

tion. Preach it out of a full heart, a clear mind, a strong conviction, and a consistent life. Receive it by faith, welcome it by love, and prove it by obedience. Then shall we have no fear for present or future, for the Word is still the seed that quickens, the sword that pierces, the light that guides, the hammer that breaks, the meat that strengthens, the milk that nourishes, and the honey that delights, because it is the Word of God that liveth and abideth forever.

THE LAST ADVENTURE

ALL forms of life are endless; each frail vase
 Is emptied o'er and o'er—but filled again;
 And never tangled is the wondrous maze
 Of nature's melodies through endless days—
 And yet forever new and sweet to men.

Gleams hint that life upon some future waits;
 The worm cannot forecast the butterfly—
 And yet the transformation but creates
 A step in the same nature which now mates
 Our own—and may life's mystery untie.

Mayhap the butterfly this message brings:
 "The law uncomprehended, I obey;
 Although the lowliest of earth-bred things,
 Even I have been reborn with urgent wings,
 And heavenward fly—who crept but yesterday."

In life's fair mansion I am but a guest;
 And life will bring fulfillment of the gleam.
 I trust this last adventure is the best,
 The crowning of this earthly life's behest,
 The consummation of the poet's dream.

—James Terry White.

A PILGRIMAGE TOWARDS UNITY

BY RT. REV. CHARLES H. BRENT, D.D., Chairman of the Preliminary Meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva, Switzerland.

TEN years ago a little group of Christians embraced the purpose, first conceived at an early Eucharist, of joining together in a special pilgrimage towards unity in the broken Church of Jesus Christ. It was not a man-made scheme but a humble endeavor to put ourselves in accord with the mind of our Lord expressed in His prayer *that they all may be one*. From this modest beginning a world-wide movement has grown, so that at the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order which has just closed at Geneva, eighty Churches and forty nations were represented. This Conference marks a stage on our journey and also exhibits the spirit of the pilgrims some of whom, such as the Germans and the Roumanians, came at great cost to themselves.

Our journey is a long one. Christians have taken more than a thousand years to reach the far country of disunion where they now reside. We cannot return home again in a moment. Some of the pilgrims who first caught the vision a decade since had hardly hoped to get as far as they have in so brief a space of time. The temptation is to be content with slow progress, and to rest satisfied with something less than the goal of God's placing—a Church, on earth, among men, visibly and organically one. Partial unities seem more possible and federation has alluring features, but they fall far short of home. Then, too, according to God's design, impossibilities are the only aim high enough for human capacity. We have allowed ourselves to take for granted the necessity of Christian disunion, blind to the fact that oneness is the first, not the last, requirement for God's firm foothold among men. The tinkling ambitions of separation are shocking in the face of a shattered, bewildered

world that is looking for leadership and finding none. The performance of the Churches, first and last, individually and collectively, is pitiful measured by their high sounding professions and claims. The failure of Christianity—and it has failed—is the inevitable failure of a kingdom divided against itself. It will go on failing until it manifests unity and all the privileges and wealth which each enjoys separately are placed at the disposal of all.

The pilgrims do not maintain that theirs is the only method of travel, by the way of conference on Faith and Order, but they do contend that theirs is the only goal and that the spirit for which conference stands is the only spirit for a pilgrim towards unity—the filial spirit which embraces God's purpose as its own and the fraternal spirit which claims each Christian as a brother beloved. Through a long stretch of time controversy has burned with fierce flame in the Churches, great and small, and has blackened and scorched many a fair subject. It is not extinguished yet. The spirit of controversy rejoices in dialectic victory—what a hollow triumph it is!—and gloats over a defeated foe. The spirit of conference is the slave of the Truth and weeps because gulfs remain unbridged and good men are alienated from one another. Controversy loves war and conference loves peace. Controversy has great respect for its own convictions and little for those of others. Conference applies the Golden Rule to the separated and demands mutual respect for each other's convictions.

For a week the pilgrims were in conference in Geneva. Differences of thought were sketched in clear outline nor did any immediate reconciliation appear on the horizon, but never was there a word of harshness or self-will. The common conviction at the centre of being, was that difficulties boldly exposed and openly met, were the only difficulties in a fair way to settlement. What ap-

pear as contradictions have, as the secret of their strength, riches of being which, when at length put into harmonious relation to the whole of God's scheme, will be revealed as supplementary elements necessary to perfection. The study of the Church as it exists in the mind of God, of what we mean by unity, of the sources of the Church's inspiration, of the best expression in language of a living faith, occupied the prayers and thoughts of the pilgrims during the conference, and for a long time to come will continue to occupy them. Faith first and then Order. The inner principle of life, the ideal, and then the mode of propagating and protecting by organic self-government of what is within.

The competition of Churches received a body blow from the united action of the pilgrims. It is a sin against love to endeavor to detach a Christian from his own Church in order to aid another Church to increase its roll. Sheep-stealing in the cattle world is held to be a crime. How then ought it to be viewed by the under-shepherds of the Good Shepherd? That is a question which the pilgrims ask of all the Churches. It is not as though the whole world were evangelized or there were any dearth of opportunity anywhere. The number of unconverted and untouched in almost any given community form the majority of that community. A combined effort in the direction of those who know not Christ is our elementary duty.

The Spirit of God was the strength of the pilgrims. He made us one in our fellowship. The conference was a living body. Life touched life, nation touched nation, the spirit of the East held communion with the spirit of the West as perhaps never before. By invitation on the last day of the conference we gathered together—it was the Feast of the Transfiguration in the Eastern calendar—in the Russian Orthodox Church in Geneva for the solemn worship of the divine liturgy. Anglican, Baptist,

Old Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Quaker, were all there, and all there to worship. The Metropolitan of Seleukia in a spiritual address spoke to the pilgrims of his own joy in the vision of unity, and told how, out of the transfigured troubles and pains of the present, would rise the glory of the future. We of the West need the fragrant, graceful worship of the East. The beauty of God filled His temple. We felt that we had been drawn within the pearly gates of the Apocalypse, and we came away with pain *bénit* and grapes in our hands, and sweetness in our souls, under the spell of the mystic East. It was fitting that we should forthwith consider certain proposals of the Orthodox Churches, sane and strong, touching on coöperation and fellowship. A few minutes later and the conference became a fact of history, a hope and a vision.

The pilgrims go home with added inspiration, conviction and responsibility. No one departed unmoved. What another decade will bring forth in this movement who can say? But it is in the hands of God from Whom it came and to Whom it belongs. It is ours only so far as we recognize it to be His. Directly and indirectly it has already reached far. Its possibilities are measured only by our willingness to explore them. They will be realized fully if we pilgrims continue to aim to do our little share as God whose coworkers we are, does His great share. Some day there will be one flock under one Shepherd. We pilgrims register our active belief in this fact and promise to pursue our journey until we reach the Heaven where we would be.

THE DISCIPLES' PROGRAMME FOR UNION

BY PROF. GEORGE W. BROWN, PH.D., TRANSYLVANIA COLLEGE,
LEXINGTON, KY.

THE movement of the Disciples was born of a sentiment for Christian union. According to Richardson (*Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*), when Thomas Campbell settled in Western Pennsylvania, "the Seceder congregations (to which sect Campbell belonged) were much pleased at having so important an accession to their ministry, * * * they came to regard him as the most learned and talented in their ranks. He had not, however, been very long engaged in his regular ministrations among the churches before some suspicions began to arise in the minds of his ministerial brethren that he was disposed to relax too much the rigidity of their ecclesiastical rules, and to cherish for other denominations feelings of fraternity and respect in which they could not share. * * * It happened that about this time he was deputed to visit a few scattered members of the flock who were living at some distance up the Alleghany, above Pittsburgh, and to hold among them, in company with a young minister, a Mr. Wilson, a communion celebration. This part of the country was then thinly settled, and it was seldom that ministerial services were enjoyed by the various fragments of religious parties which had been thrown together in the circling eddies of these new settlements. Mr. Campbell's sympathies were strongly aroused in regard to the destitute condition of some of the vicinity who belonged to other branches of the Presbyterian family, and who had not, for a long time, had the opportunity of partaking of the Lord's Supper, and he felt it his duty, in the preparation sermon, to lament the existing divisions, and to suggest that all his pious hearers, who felt so disposed and duly prepared, should, without respect to party differences, enjoy the benefits of the communion season then providentially afforded

them. Mr. Wilson did not, at that time, publicly oppose these overtures, but finding that Mr. Campbell had little respect for the division walls which the different parties had built up with so much pains, his sectarian prejudices became fully aroused. He felt it his duty, therefore, at the next meeting of the presbytery, to lay the case before it in the usual form of 'libel.' " It was this regard for the conditions of others not of his own sect, and the resulting opposition of Mr. Wilson, which led to the dispute between Mr. Campbell and the Seceder presbytery, and eventually to his separation from that communion, and the establishment of the Disciple movement.

The great fundamental document of the new movement, written by Thomas Campbell and given to the world shortly after the culmination of the dispute with the presbytery, is the "Declaration and Address." Perhaps the most significant passage in this great document is this one; "You are all, dear brethren, equally included as the objects of our esteem and love. With you all we desire to unite in the bonds of an entire Christian unity—Christ alone being the head, the center, His word the rule, and explicit belief of and manifest conformity to it in all things, the terms." Here we have set forth the great purpose of the movement, union in Christ; the platform proposed is the Word of Christ. Thirteen propositions subjoined to the document are intended to set forth succinctly the principles of the movement. The first one of these affirms that the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one; the second that there ought to be no schisms in the Church; third declares that nothing ought to be considered an article of faith except what is expressly taught and enjoined in the Word of God. The remaining articles are explanations of these three.

It is unnecessary to go further into the early history of the Disciple movement. Enough has been said to

make it clear that union was the primary thing in the movement. The programme for union was the whole programme. The platform might be stated as loyalty to Christ. To be sure, it was a spirit of loyalty to Christ which led to the formulation of the programme itself, to the initial purpose of the movement. For a desire for union might grow out of the ambition to rule, to magnify and enlarge one's own sect, or one's personal power or influence. But among the founders of this movement this was not the case. The desire was to live according to the principles of the seventeenth chapter of John.

A pertinent question is this; Did this programme always remain to the front in the consciousness of the Disciples? The answer would be, that for a time it did. But the movement suffered the same fate that all other great movements have suffered. That is, after the first great impulse, and especially after new hands took control of things, interest was centered more on the mechanics of the movement than on the movement itself, more on the platform than on the purpose, more on the formal than on the spiritual. At first it was a movement for union; it was referred to as a reformation, or the "current reformation." During their sojourn in the tents of the Baptists, the Disciples began to concentrate attention on the restoration of the ancient order of things. But this was but a means to the end. The interest of the early Disciples in the ancient order could not outweigh their broad sympathies and their desire for union. After the separation from the Baptists, interest in the ancient order, at least in the minds of some, continued to increase. Eventually a new name was proposed for the movement. Perhaps a half century after its successful launching as a union movement, some began to feel that the primary purpose of the movement was the restoration of the conditions of the early Church, and they began to speak of the movement as the "restoration movement." In time

this view began to be held by a large number of Disciples. They placed an ever increasing emphasis on restoration, with a constantly decreasing emphasis on Christian union. So pronounced did this attitude become that the restoration wing of this movement, if I may be permitted to use the term, finally gave up all direct efforts toward union, and centered its attention on the elaboration of the details of the organization, faith, and polity of the primitive Church. To be sure, even this wing professes an academic interest in union. It conceives its task to be the proclaiming of the conditions of the primitive Church. It feels that it is the duty of all to accept these conditions, and when this is done, union will come automatically. Some representatives of this branch may occasionally be found who go so far as to deny the essential Christianity of those who are unwilling to accept these primitive beliefs and practices for themselves, at least as these are understood by them. To be sure, this does not represent the feeling of the great mass of Disciples. Nor is such a feeling conducive to union; it simply makes the holder of such a view quite as sectarian as any one else and reduces him to zero as a factor in bringing about Christian union.

One can not question the right of a person or a group of persons, to change the purpose which dominates the person or the group. The Disciples have the right, if they choose to exercise it, of changing their original union movement into a restoration movement. One can raise no question as to the motive which leads some to cease emphasizing Christian union and to place their emphasis on restoration as an end in itself. But one who has a primary interest in union can only regret this, for he can not feel other than that if this movement had only the present restoration programme before them, they could not legitimately be spoken of as having a union programme.

But not all Disciples have joined in the restoration programme. The majority of them still keep before them the original union programme. Necessarily, that programme has to be modified from time to time in some of its details along with the changing thought and life of the world. For one thing, when the movement first arose there was a practically universal acceptance among Protestants of the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Very much of the reasoning and some of the specific matters advanced have had to be changed because of the fact that relatively few thinkers hold to that doctrine to-day. An earlier generation considered any statement in the Bible as having equal force with all other statements in it, for is it not all the Word of God? True, some drew a distinction between the Old and the New Testaments. All written statements, though, had the same value as something said by Christ Himself. But the present generation does not so regard the Bible. It looks for its authority rather in the person and character of Christ Himself, and for guidance to the Holy Spirit. Hence there is a growing tendency among Disciples, as in the Christian world at large, to lay an ever larger emphasis on making Christ alone the head, the center, to use Thomas Campbell's words, with a corresponding tendency to look upon the Bible as being the history of God's revelation to man through the Jewish people, and the Prophets, Apostles, and Saviour who appeared among them. In other words, the tendency is to exalt Christ more and more above the Book which contains the record of His life and mighty works. And so the current union programme of this movement, and I use the term in contradistinction to the restoration programme advocated by some, centers more on Christ than on the practices or polity of the Church. It pleads primarily for union in Christ, seeking only to restore so much of the primitive Church as may be necessary to bring about unity, and is not interested in the

complete restoration of all the conditions of the early Church. Union is of greater importance than the reproduction of early forms; the spirit rather than the letter is dominant.

This movement has a big and positive programme for Christian union before it. A large number of Disciples are most deeply interested in it, and are firmly convinced that the plea for the reunion of the Church is the greatest message which has been given to the Christian world since the day of Pentecost. They are heart and soul in favor of the content and presentation of this plea. Internal differences have kept many silent when they would have liked to speak, and have held back many because of the lack of strong leadership to take them where they want to go. But the yearning is there, in the hearts of thousands, who are waiting to hear the clear and definite enunciation of a programme which shall come from the whole united body.

The programme of the Disciples, as far as it has been formulated, exalts Jesus to the highest possible place, finding in Him the revelation of the character of God presented to man for his guidance in the long journey he is making toward the attainment of the divine character. It lays its great emphasis on the Spirit and the Spirit filled life. It looks with reverence and respect on all who follow Jesus as being fellow Christians, giving them all credit for their loyalty to Him, and pleading for union with them, not so much on a categorical platform as in Christ Himself. It believes that the reconciliation of the separated members of the body of Christ is to be brought about by love rather than by logic. The programme for union presents Christ as the basis of union.

The present programme for union concurs fully in Thomas Campbell's dictum, "That although inferences and deductions, from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy

Word, yet they are not formally binding on the consciences of Christians further than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so." And probably this generation would be much more conservative in the making of such deductions than even the generation of Thomas Campbell. For since Christ is being presented as the basis of union, and the present generation is conscious of its finiteness before him, it is extremely careful about assuming a dogmatic attitude. For Disciples are well aware that many of Christ's followers, who are on as high a spiritual level as they are themselves, who have received the earnest of His Spirit as well as they themselves have, men who are just as keen in intellect and just as loyal in heart to Christ as they are themselves, have come to quite different conclusions on many matters relating to the Church. And so the Disciple who has a union programme does not assume a superior or dictatorial air; he meets others with humility and love, that together they may be able to find out the will of God. This programme for union involves a broad charity to all, whether of their own brotherhood or not, a bearing with differences of opinion and practice, a constant reconsideration of all the elements which enter into the faith and practice of the Christian world. It involves a lessened confidence in the infallibility of one's own judgment, and a greater turning to God, that He may lead to the performance of His will.

The Disciples' programme for union involves harmony among themselves. The evil of overemphasizing the method to be followed in the obtaining of union rather than placing the emphasis on union itself early led to sad fruits among them. It led to a very literalistic way of interpreting the Bible. Things not mentioned in the Scripture as part of the polity or practice of the early Church were put under the ban and made a test of fellowship. There were controversies over the organ, the

Sunday-school, the missionary society. A large number who started with the movement withdrew, and are now known to the census as "Churches of Christ." There are over 300,000 of these, more than a fifth of the number who ought to be travelling the road together. Even now there is more controversy. Again the missionary society has been brought to the front. Other clouds darken the skies. That those who opposed the main current of Disciple thought and progress in the past, or who may be opposing it at the present have been or are lacking in a desire to be loyal to Christ is not to be thought of. No doubt here and there persons may be found who from some other motive than this may be taking the course they have taken, but this is not true of most. They are trying, each in his own way, to be loyal to Christ, but they differ in their conception of what loyalty demands. The ultimate triumph of the Disciples' programme for union demands that their discordant elements get together and then live and work together in love and harmony. The great mass of Disciples feels a warm sympathy with all coöperative movements and gladly join in conferences with other Christians for the furtherance of the unity of the Church.

EDITORIAL

THREE OUTSTANDING CONFERENCES

SWITZERLAND was the meeting place during the month of August of three conferences, so outstanding in their results and purposes that it is not inappropriate to name them among the definite events of the year that make for better conditions among men, especially as related to the unity of the Church and good will toward all mankind. The first had to do with *life and work*; the second with *faith and order*; the third with *international friendship*. The three movements are entirely independent of each other, but they nevertheless supplement each other. When men come from all parts of the world to confer regarding the principles embodied in the phrases descriptive of these movements, these are the indications of a new and better day in human affairs. The combined delegations would not exceed four or five hundred, but the delegates came from all parts of the world, so that nearly a hundred different Christian Churches were represented from nearly fifty countries.

Switzerland was the proper place for such gatherings, especially Geneva as the starting place, because in Geneva near the spot where John Calvin had Michael Servetus burned alive at the stake because of some theological differences between them, there now stands a granite shaft upon one side of which is inscribed the simple fact that at that place Michael Servetus died at the stake, October 27, 1553, having been born in the village of Agrogan, September 29, 1511. On the opposite side is this inscription:

We the respectful and grateful sons of Calvin, our great reformer, condemning his error, which was one of his age, and holding firmly to the liberty of conscience, according to the true principles of the Reformation and of the Gospel, have erected this expiatory monument, October 27, 1903.

There may be as courageous Christians elsewhere ready to erect such expiatory monuments as this Swiss committee, of which Dr. J. Eugène Choisy, of the Geneva University, was chairman, but we have not found them. Although three hundred and fifty years intervened before this expiatory monument could be erected, nevertheless it is erected and its confession may be read by the whole world. There are ten thousand others like it to be set up before we can have permanent Christian unity and permanent international friendship. The inscriptions need not be in stone, but they have got to be somewhere, especially on the heart. Repentance is the boundary line in our approaches toward all permanency in Christian unity and international friendship. Perhaps the committees that had charge of selecting the places of meeting did not know of this modest monument on Champel. It is likely that they did not. Then it is all the more evident that the Holy Spirit called us to this beginning place for the most difficult lesson in human experience.

CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK

This preliminary conference, which held its sessions at Hotel Beau Séjour, Geneva, was composed of eighty-eight delegates from fifteen different countries. Out of this conference of little more than two days came what appears to be one of the most important movements of our times. Its emphasis is on Christian life and Christian work. It avoids the technical and goes at once to the simple and practical. There is a democracy in its principles that must commend it to all who see the world's need of a better Christian life and better Christian work. Its title indicates the prophetic element and its catholicity includes the whole Church if the whole Church cares to meet the world's greatest need.

The Archbishop of Uppsala has been one of the foremost prophets in this movement, having proclaimed it,

first in the Scandinavian countries and later throughout Europe. Dr. Frederick Lynch and Dr. Charles S. Macfarland of the American Federal Council of the Churches of Christ have been the spokesmen on the American side of the Atlantic for internationalizing the Federal Council idea. At the meeting of the International Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches last October at The Hague, the Archbishop ably laid this matter before the committee. It was decided then to make it an independent movement and the recent meeting at the Hotel Beau Séjour was the result. The plans outlined are adequate for bringing together the Christian forces of the whole world. The delegates present were larger from that part of Christendom designated as the evangelicals. All parts of Christendom will be approached relative to coöperation in the life and work of Christianity. This makes an appeal for Christian unity from an angle that must arrest the thoughtful in the cause of unity in all Churches. Our theories about the unity of Christendom may be what they may, but Christian life and Christian work are two forces that are least in the realm of controversy and their service is more needed than that of those subjects that are in the realm of controversy.

It is an introduction of the ethical element in the problem of Christian unity, which is greatly needed, for it is altogether possible that the first basis in Christian unity will be ethical rather than theological. The first is not entirely new to many who are already pioneers in these ethical principles of coöperation. Its newness consists in its emphasis upon life as well as work and the international character of both life and work. Multitudes of things can be done by this movement and done well, while without such a movement divided Christendom might indefinitely continue its weak and unsatisfactory contributions to the solution of problems that have to do

with the common needs of all nations. It will take time for this movement to properly adjust itself to the immediate needs, but it is headed toward a great task with hopeful results.

CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

SINCE 1910 all persons interested in Christian unity have been looking forward eagerly to the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order. No man has been so tireless in bringing this to pass as Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, whose secretarial service has brought him in touch with all parts of the Church in every part of the world. His patient and gentle spirit, his strong and unfailing faith in the idea of a united Christendom, his world grasp and untiring energies have had their reward in this preliminary meeting, held at the Athénée, one of the university buildings, Geneva, August 12-19, 1920.

The year 1910 was the year of a general awakening in Christian unity affairs. In the early summer of that year some American Episcopalians organized the Christian Unity Foundation in New York for research and conference. That fall the General Convention of the Episcopal Church appointed a committee on a world conference on faith and order. On the same day the American Disciples of Christ in their General Convention organized their Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. About that time the American Congregational Church in their National Council appointed a committee on Christian union. The Church of England and the Presbyterian Church in Australia and Tasmania made approaches toward each other. Likewise the Eastern Orthodox Church had its interest quickened in the unity of Christendom about that time. The plans of the American Episcopal commission for a world conference soon put it in the position of leadership and the other move-

ments gladly coöperated with and supplemented in the work of the Episcopal commission.

In this recent preliminary conference eighty Churches were represented from forty countries. The purpose of this conference was to devise plans for the World Conference, which is to be held at some time and place not yet decided. There was no published programme. The business committee arranged the programme for each succeeding day as its judgment directed, consequently there were no prepared addresses during any of the sessions, all topics being informally discussed. The first topic was "The Church and the Nature of the United Church." The point of contrast between the opposing views was voiced by Bishop Gore, of England, in the questions: Must there be an authoritative creed, authoritative sacraments and an authoritative ministry? Or is freedom incompatible with such conditions? The discussion of these topics revealed the difficulties of adjustment between the institutional and non-institutional interpretations. The sacramentalist and the sacramentarian see things differently. There is always progress in a conference, however, when the differences are clearly seen by all parties. The next step is for adjustment. Because men are Christians there lies the possibility of adjusting Christian principles however widely they may appear to differ. This is the work of the World Conference.

The second topic had to do with the question, "What Is the Place of the Bible and a Creed in Relation to Reunion?" Dr. C. Anderson Scott, of England, in his addresses which opened and closed the discussion on this subject, recognized the permanent place of the Bible and pointed out the necessity of a revised creedal statement in keeping with scriptural declaration and modern times. This at once raised the question as to the Church's attitude toward the ancient creeds and again there were two groups—those who revered the past so devoutly that they

felt the ancient creeds such as the Nicæan Creed and the Apostles' Creed should be incorporated into the life of the present day Church, holding continuity with all the past, and those who likewise revered the past and honored the long line of the faithful in Christ, but who felt that we must speak to the people of this day in the language of to-day. This was carried further in these questions of the Continuation Committee:

1. What degree of unity in faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?

2. Is the statement of this one faith in the form of a creed necessary or desirable?

3. If so, what creed should be used, or what other formulæ would be desirable?

4. What are the proper uses of a creed and of a confession of faith?

These are the questions for the World Conference. Around these and others like them local conferences may be and doubtless will be held in preparation for the World Conference, so as to find the mind of the whole Church on these subjects.

As important as these subjects are and no one doubts their importance, there is another transcendently more important, which must have a place in the World Conference. There is a possibility that in time there may be a unanimity throughout the whole Church on the subjects presented or there will be such adjustment as to make it possible for the whole Church to work together, but without this third element all agreements would be formal and meaningless. Indeed unity cannot come without this. It is expressed in the words of Jesus: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another." There may be historic validity in the creeds, sacraments, ministry and the Bible, but no one of these, nor all of these combined are the real evidences of discipleship. Love is that divine insignia. Society has not accepted it. Political govern-

ments know nothing about it. The Church is largely ignorant of it and the best evidence of its lack of knowledge is its complacency in the midst of its multiplicity of divisions and its patronage of the inequitable conditions around us. Love is so revolutionary that its practice would upset the present social order. The way to its understanding is not easy. The other subjects may be worked out satisfactorily in the library and around the conference table, but the meaning of love can only be found as Jesus revealed it in his life and death. Well might He say to the various Christian communions, as He said to His disciples of old, "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink of and be baptized with the baptism which I am baptized with?" It is a costly pathway, but it is the way to the unity of the Church of Christ. The adjusting of other things will help; only love will clothe the Church with divine power and we look for it.

The presence of the Eastern Orthodox delegates was a fine contribution to the conference. The suggestions of the Metropolitan of Seleukia, Bishop Germanos, relative to the steps toward unity were as timely and practical as though they had been formulated in a conference in America. The Eastern Orthodox Church has turned its face toward the front with an understanding and purpose that means a new day in its history as well as a new force in the Christian unity problem. Sectional unions must come first and the presence of the Eastern Orthodox delegates in the conference may mean the opening of the way toward union between themselves and the Anglicans. It would heal one of the divisions in the episcopacy to say the least. Such a union would hasten the union of the Protestant household, which is already discovering itself to be embarrassingly too nearly agreed to be apart. Turns in the road indicate new possibilities.

The Continuation Committee will carry forward the

work of the conference. Bishop Brent, in his closing words as chairman, emphasized that the preliminary conference is a fact, a reality, a hope, that only the difficulties that are fairly faced have hope of solution, that we are a group of constructionists, that the major difficulties are moral rather than theological and that we must pray as well as think. A sense of brotherhood was establsished in the conference. The approaches toward each other were frank and friendly. A hopeful outlook will go from this preliminary conference upon the great problems that face us.

CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP

THE International Committee of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches had its beginning in a conference of representatives of the various Churches held in Constance, August 1, 1914—the fateful day that marked the opening of the world war. Every other means having been tried to promote the peace of the world and failed, it was the belief of some that the only way to secure permanent peace would be to bring to bear upon international life the principles of Christian fellowship. Many maintained these ideals throughout the war and see now more than ever the need of pressing them upon the conscience of the world, both for healing the sore of the recent war and for preventing further conflicts.

Last October the International Committee met at The Hague. This year it met at St. Beatenberg, Switzerland, August 24-28. No more beautiful spot in all Europe could have been found—isolated from the world and there amid the Alps with Jungfrau, Mönch and Eiger looking down upon us, as we half way up the sides of the opposite mountain at Hotel Victoria looked out upon their snow capped peaks thirteen miles away, with the glow of the morning reaching from the face of the blue

waters of Lake Thune up the deep green sides of the mountains to the snow and on to the dome of the sky and fourteen hours later with sunset draperies covering the lake, the vale, the mountains, the sky. Sunday preceding the conference and the closing day of the conference were almost cloudless. The other days clouds hung heavy over the mountains far down into the valley as though to remind us of the smouldering fires of war, the threatening of a clash between the Orient and the Occident and the suspicious attitudes of the nations toward each other. But with the Psalmist it might be said,

I will lift up mine eyes unto the mountains:
From whence shall my help come?
My help cometh from Jehovah,
Who made heaven and earth.

Our help is not in great fortresses and vast armaments, but in the Lord Almighty. We who are believers in Him are to set ourselves to the task of international reconciliation by better understanding among the nations, cultivation of good will and tolerance. The world must come to know that the ethical principles that control individuals must control nations. A Christian civilization can only be maintained by applying the principles of Christ to whole nations as well as individuals. The World Alliance has a place in the affairs of the world and the recent meeting of the International Committee indicated the seriousness with which it is going to its task.

There are now twenty-two nations with their national councils, which are auxiliaries to the World Alliance and these are represented on the International Committee. They are the United States, 13 members; Great Britain, 8; France, 8; Germany, 8; and four to each of the following: Denmark, Holland, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, Greece, Esthonia, Finland, Hungary, Lettland, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Roumania, Bulgaria and Japan. Other nations

will be brought into the movement. Cordial relations have been established with the Roman Catholic Committee on international studies under the chairmanship of Baron de Montenach at Fribourg, Switzerland. The task of the national councils is to promote good will between the nations.

The first resolution passed at the St. Beatenberg meeting indicated the purpose and passion of this movement. The resolution is as follows:

That the members of the World Alliance, gathered from many lands and various communions and associated for the purpose of promoting friendship and good will between nations, declare their convictions that these blessings can only be attained by the divine power of Christ working upon the hearts of men and creating therein the true spirit of brotherhood; they believe that that power may be evoked by a common effort of prayer and sacrifice; and whilst acknowledging their own shortcomings and unfitness for this task, they hereby humbly devote themselves to it as followers of Christ and servants of all mankind."

From this prophetic outlook, the conference passed from subject to subject, discussing frankly questions having to do with the double standard of morality, by which ethical demands are limited to private life and the evil of nations acting by their own standards, when the only hope of peace among nations is the application of Christian principles to international affairs; the publicity of diplomatic transactions; the rights of religious minorities; foreign missionary activities and the coöperation of the foreign missionaries in the work of the Alliance: the duty of the Church in putting forth such "fraternal effort to overcome the bitterness and rancour of strife" so that "all may feel themselves to be brethren;" the League of Nations as a possibility "to achieve international peace and security," especially emphasizing all nations to become members as speedily as possible, for the "alternative of the League can be nothing else than a

crushing increase in competitive armaments in all nations and desperate preparation for a war more deadly and destructive than anything the world has seen." Other topics of like character followed these. It was a meeting for direct action for a better world.

Eastern Orthodox and Quakers, Anglicans and Non-conformists, Christians from various communions in America and in Europe mingled together in apparent forgetfulness of their theological differences. All looked out upon the immediate needs of a weary world. Dr. George Nasmyth did praiseworthy service the past year as international organizer. Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson directed the affairs of the Alliance with commendable statesmanship as the honorary secretary. The Most Rev. R. T. Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, was elected president of the Alliance. Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, of America, was elected chairman of the International Committee. The St. Beatenberg conference furnished a clearing house for some misunderstandings; an open door for service; an inspiration for the prophets of common betterment. Bringing groups together from so many nations is of itself a great service. The worth of that service is intensified when these groups unite their interest for a common cause. The World Alliance is doing courageous service and its influence will go to the ends of the earth.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

WITH the Archbishop of Uppsala in Europe and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America agitating a world movement dealing with the life and work of the Church a new movement came into being at Geneva, Switzerland, August 9-12, 1920, under the name, "Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work." The brief of the preliminary meeting as taken from the published records is as follows:

Actions were taken in response to the request of a preliminary conference held in Paris, November 17, 1919, at which there were present representatives of the Scandinavian, Swiss and American Churches. This conference was called by a committee consisting of the Archbishop of Uppsala, Dean Herold of Switzerland and Rev. Chas. S. Macfarland of the American Federal Council. From this meeting invitations were sent by Dr. Macfarland as the general secretary. Representatives were selected formally or informally as the bodies sending them made choice. It was the sense of the Federal Council committee that the representatives be selected from the Protestant evangelical Churches as a group in each country. In those nations where there were federations of Churches, selections were made by the federations. In other countries joint action was taken so that the delegates represented the Protestant evangelical Churches.

Prof. Eugène Choisy called the meeting to order in the Hotel Beau Séjour, Geneva, on the morning of August 10th and was the chairman of the first session. Mr. F. P. Turner, Dr. Yngre Brilioth and Pastor Adolf Keller were named as recording secretaries. Dr. Macfarland outlined the steps leading up to the present meeting and the Archbishop of Uppsala delivered an informing address on "The Idea, Purpose and Need of an Ecumenical Conference." Dr. Frederick Lynch, of New York, followed in cordial support of the Archbishop's plans and proposed that the regular conference be called two or three years hence or at such time as the committee of arrangements may decide which was agreed to.

Three sessions occupied each day. Dr. A. J. Brown, of New York, Dr. J. A. McClymont of Edinburgh, Bishop Harald Ostenfeld of Copenhagen and Dr. J. A. Cramer of The Hague were chairmen of the various sessions. Suggestions regarding the programme of the conference were fully discussed. It was recommended to the committee on arrangements to provide for discussion on the programme as follows:

1. Christian brotherhood and righteousness in international relations. Creation of a Christian disposition of mind as a necessary soul to the commonwealth of nations.
2. The Christian conception of the system of law as a gift of God; necessity of its extension.
3. Christian principles in social life and in the social and economic construction of society. Relation to labour movement. It was further recommended that there should be discussion of Christian education, liberty of conscience, protection of religious minorities, white slave traffic, bad business morals, exploitation of natives, intemperance, gambling, protection of family life, recreation, recruiting

Visitors from the Eastern Orthodox Church were welcomed in an address delivered in Greek by Rev. Herman Neander to which the Metropolitan of Seleukia, Germanos Strinopoulos, responded, closing his address with prayer. The Archbishop of Uppsala replied in a message of good fellowship.

It was decided to invite all Christian communions to participate in the proposed conference and that the committee of arrangements be requested to consider the advisability of inviting representatives of the outstanding auxiliary agencies of the Church. The place of holding the conference was left to the committee of arrangements. The nucleus of that committee is as follows: Archbishop of Uppsala, provisional chairman, Dr. Chas. S. Macfarland and Dr. Frederick Lynch, provisional general secretaries, Dr. Ainslie of America, Dr. Aulén of Sweden, Dr. Boynton of America, Bishop Brent of America, Dr. Brown of America, Bishop Cannon of America, Dr. Chester of America, Prof. Choisy of Switzerland, Dr. Cramer of Holland, Pastor Giampiccoli of Italy, Dr. Gleditsch of Norway, Bishop Hurst of America, Pastor Keller of Switzerland, Dr. Larsen of America, Dr. McClymont of Scotland, Dr. MacGilp of Scotland, Dr. Merrill of America, Mr. Nightingale of England, Bishop Nuelsen of Switzerland, Bishop Ostenfeld of Denmark, Bishop Raffay of Hungary and Dr. Szabo of Hungary. There are to be three groups in the committee of arrangements—one in America, one in Great Britain and one on the continent of Europe. Each group is to select its own chairman and secretary and three other members with power to act in their sphere. Dr. Lynch was appointed chairman for the American group and the Archbishop of Uppsala for the European group. The executive committee will meet in London in January 1921. The spirit of the meeting was rich in fellowship. Eighty-eight delegates from fifteen countries were present. The meeting closed with the following appeal for prayer:

“The members of this preliminary international commission at Geneva, drawn together by a consciousness of the painful and urgent need of the world, and by a conviction that only the Gospel and spirit and leadership of Jesus Christ can meet that need, and that only a Church united, consecrated, daring, and self-forgetful can form the body, through which this spirit may do His gracious and healing work, earnestly and solemnly appeal to Christians of every name and form, of every land and race, to pray now and continually for the coming of a fuller unity of spirit and of action in the entire Church of Christ throughout the world; for a readiness on the part of all Christians to make new ventures of faith, and to take more seriously the implications of the Gospel; for the deepening and broadening of love among all Christ’s followers toward all men; for the elimination of all passion and prejudice, and the growth of peace and brotherhood; for clearer vision of the will of God and of the work of Christ in this day; and for all that may further the coming of His Kingdom.

“Especially do we ask our fellow-Christians, everywhere, to pray for the success of the conference which is to consider the place and duty of the Church of Christ, and the claims upon it of the Master and of mankind. The united and unceasing intercession of all Christians is asked, that, through this gathering of Christians from all the world, the Church may come to a clear realisation of its unity, its opportunity, and its responsibility; that the spirit of Christ may fill and control His body, the Church; and that, through His mighty and gracious working, mankind may be led into the larger life which is in Him, and the whole creation now groaning and travailing in pain, may be delivered from the bondage of corruption and brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.”

The preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order was held at the Athénée, Geneva, August 12-19, and a brief record of the transaction there is taken from the report of Robert H. Gardiner, the secretary, as follows:

The meeting was called to order by the Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D.D., of Buffalo, N. Y., in the absence of the Rt. Rev. Charles A. Anderson, D.D., of Chicago, who is the president of the American Episcopal commission. Bishop Brent was elected as permanent chairman, Rev. John G. Taska, D.D., of England as vice-chairman and Robert H. Gardiner as secretary. Bishop Herzog, of the Old Catholic Churches in Europe, was asked to open the meeting with prayer. He gave a few words of welcome, read Ephesians 4:1-6, offered prayer in German, concluding with the Lord's Prayer, in which all present joined, each in his own language.

Bishop Brent made an address explaining the objects and method of the World Conference on Faith and Order and the functions of this preliminary meeting. Addresses of welcome were given by Rev. Charles Martin, of Geneva, and by Rev. Adolf Keller, of Zurich. It was decided that the languages of the conference should be English, French and German and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church to speak in Greek if they so desired and it would be translated into the three languages already named. Each speaker had his remarks translated into two languages different from the one in which he spoke so that every person could fully understand what was being said and done. A business committee had charge of the details of the conference. The registration showed that eighty Churches from forty countries were represented. On the topic "The Church and the Nature of the United Church," Prof. W. A. Curtis, D.D., of Scotland, spoke for the Presbyterians, the Bishop of Bombay for the Anglicans, reading the Appeal of the recent Lambeth Conference and commenting on it, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D., of America, for the Congregationalists, Bishop John L. Nuelson, D.D., of Switzerland, for the American Methodists, Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., of America, for the Disciples of Christ, the Metropolitan of Seleukia, Germanos, for the Eastern Orthodox, speaking in Greek and Prof. Alivisatos continuing the same subject in English, Rev. H. M. Hughes, D.D., of England, for the English Wesleyans, Bishop Harald Ostenfeld, D.D., of Denmark and Prof. G. E. H. Aulén, D.D., of Sweden, for the Lutherans. Supplementary statements from others followed these speakers who had been named by the business committee to open the discussion.

Bishop Charles Gore, of England, said that it is necessary, if we are to progress, to face fully what our differences are as to the Church and the nature of unity. This Conference is only preparatory, not to devise plans of unity but to make ready for the World Conference on Faith and Order. The present Conference has to appoint committees to deal with certain subjects and prepare them for consideration by the World Conference. But we need to test whether it will be possible for us to agree on what we think the United Church should be. Federation would be short of the New Testament ideal. There is a degree of variety which destroys unity. A divine discipline upon the tendency to variations seems essential. Must there be an authoritative creed, authoritative sacraments and an authoritative ministry or is freedom incompatible with such a condition? Here perhaps is the first point of contact between opposing views.

Continuing the discussion, Rev. James Vernon Bartlet, D.D., of England, emphasized the necessity of careful consideration of the question of how far coercive discipline upon Christian freedom within the Church is

to go, how far it is according to the genius of the New Testament, and the importance of making the watchword to be 'educate,' in which there must be no relaxing of effort. Many spoke on the same topic.

"What Is the Place of the Bible and of a Creed in Relation to Reunion?" was assigned to Rev. C. Anderson Scott, D.D., of England, to open and close the discussion. He assumed that all Christian communions accorded to the Bible the supreme place of authority and then spoke at length regarding the value of holding the central idea embodied in the creeds, but the necessity of adopting the language of modern experience rather than in the term, and phrases of the fourth century. Rev. J. E. Roberts, D.D., of England, and others spoke on this subject.

The continuation committee was requested to secure the proper consideration and discussion of both of these topics in such manner as is deemed most expedient in order that the subjects may be properly prepared for discussion at the World Conference.

A communication was presented from the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Damianos, inviting the World Conference on Faith and Order to hold its next session in Jerusalem. It was voted that the Conference express its thanks for the invitation and its joy that events had made it possible for such an invitation to be extended. The invitation was referred to the continuation committee for consideration.

In the view of the presence of the Archbishop of Volhynia, Eulogius, the following action was taken:

That the conference put on record its deep regret that the venerable Church of Russia has been prevented from sending representatives to its meetings, and that the conference express its profound sympathy with the Russian Church under her severe afflictions, and assure her of their prayers to Almighty God to give her a happy issue from all her sufferings, and grant her the reward of faithful endurance.

The Archbishop of Volhynia addressed the meeting in Russian, and Archpriest Orloff of the Russian Church of Geneva, who accompanied him, was made welcome to the conference.

The continuation committee was charged with the duty of carrying on the work of preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order, conducting correspondence, raising funds, fixing the time and place of the conference, and performing such other duties as may be necessary in arranging for the conference. The continuation committee consists of Bishop Brent, chairman, Robert Gardiner, secretary, George Zabriskie, treasurer, and for the Anglicans, Bishop of Bombay, Bishop of Willochra, Bishop of Winchester, Rev. W. T. Manning, D.D., Rev. W. E. S. Holland; for Armenians, Archbishop Dourian, Bishop Abrahamian; for the Baptists, Rev. J. E. Roberts, D.D., Rev. W. C. P. Rhoades, D.D., Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, D.D., Rev. Cornelius Woelfkin, D.D., Rev. Dr. Ruth; for the Congregationalists, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D., Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D., Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., Rev. Dr. Chang; for the Disciples, Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D.; for the Eastern Orthodox, Metropolitan of Seleukia, Archbishop Platon, Bishop of Timok, Archimandrite Papadopoulos, Archimandrite Gheorghieff, Prof. Alivisatos, Prof. Sokolof, Prof. Demetrescu; for the German Evangelical, Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze; for the Lutherans, Archbishop Söderblom, Bishop Harald Ostenfeld, Bishop Tandberg, Pastor N. B. Thvedt, Rev. Dr. Morehead, Rev. Dr. Ehmelt; for the Methodist, Bishop James Cannon, Bishop McConnell, Rev. George Hall, Rev. H. M. Hughes, D.D., Rev. J. G. Taska, D.D.; for the Old Catholics, Bishop Edward Herzog; for the Presbyterians and Reformed, Rev. A. J. Brown, D.D., Rev. Dr. Chester, Rev. Dr. Datta, Prof. Alexius de Boer, Principal Alexander Martin, Rev. J. A. McClymont, D.D., and for the Friends, Prof. Rufus M. Jones.

THE Lambeth Appeal takes its place among the significant utterances of these times relative to the reunion of Christendom. One of the Anglican bishops in Africa says that it is only a change in good-will over former Lambeth utterances. A British Nonconformist says that it is a decided advance. The Bishop of Winchester says that it may be described as a change only in the perspective. *The Guardian*, London (Anglican), says:

“Sufficient time has now elapsed since the issue of the Lambeth utterances to enable us to form some fairly definite impression of the effect produced upon the public mind by that portion of them which relates to reunion—the subject which transcends all the others upon which the Fathers of the Church have pronounced. Speaking generally, the reception of the reunion proposals has been such as to warrant warmer hopes than would have seemed possible on the first day of the conference. Those who are most closely in touch with Church feeling, those who from their great central position can most distinctly test the pulse of the Church, although they hoped much, were by no means assured of the results that have actually been achieved. The triumph of conciliation of good sense, and of higher qualities than either, has indeed been complete. Men whom there was every reason to fear would stand out stubbornly for their own terms of reunion have fallen into line with the rest of the episcopate and have given their adhesion to decisions the importance of which will probably not be fully revealed to this generation. The happy consequence is that reunion is no longer merely a pious aspiration, but has come at last into the region of practical politics. Candid Nonconformists are bound to admit, and many of them have admitted, that the conference has finally dispelled all possibility of suspicion that the Church of England is in the least degree insincere in its desire for reunion, or retains any vestige of disdain towards Nonconformity. The Church of England is now irrevocably committed to reunion, and it is only the Nonconformists who hesitate.

This hesitation appears now to be concerned chiefly, if not entirely, with the one question of re-ordination, unless it be true that the Nonconformist people in general are not yet greatly concerned about reunion. At all events it is evident that those of them who care at all care more about re-ordination than about any other aspect of the situation. Even this last barrier seems slowly to be yielding. Among the Wesleyans, the nearest to the Church of all Nonconforming bodies, reunion, with all its implications, is surely winning assent, and the more rapidly since it has come to be understood that it does not mean the abandonment of Wesleyan usages. Of the two Wesleyan newspapers, the one which is the organ of the younger men heartily advocates it, and the other is finding it necessary to follow the younger men's lead, though perhaps a little reluctantly. As to the other Nonconformist communions, there are many hopeful indications, though here again the most notable opponent of change is that irreconcilable divine, Dr. Clifford. Nor must we forget that Dr. Fleming and other Presbyterians are still stumbling over the roots of the re-ordination question—the principle of episcopacy. It is naturally difficult for them to dissociate episcopacy from that ‘prelacy’ which has been their secular bugbear. But the two things are not necessarily the same. The Presbyterian Church is itself not destitute of hierarchical degrees—indeed it is

difficult to see how any Church can be entirely without them. Nor are what is called the 'monarchical episcopate' and 'episcopacy' quite the same thing. The latter is a principle; the former is only a particular application of that principle, and perhaps not the best application. The Mansfield College Conferences have accepted the principle without committing themselves to details. All they have stipulated for is that episcopacy, to be acceptable all round, must be 'constitutional.' There may be differences of opinion as to the meaning of that word in this connection, but so many differences have already been reconciled that there should be no very serious difficulty in arriving at an agreement upon this head.

The same journal further says:

"The conference, in recognising that reunion must be a matter of time, has set out proposals for 'the period when a definite scheme of union is maturing.' A general scheme of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits is not approved. But bishops, in cases where non-episcopally and episcopally ordained ministers are working towards the ideal union, will be justified in 'giving occasional authorisation' for the interchange of pulpits. Such interchange, therefore, will depend upon the bishops, and since the resolution is their own, it should follow that all those clergy who are working towards reunion with non-episcopal bodies will receive the direct encouragement of their diocesans. In their further suggestion that baptised but unconfirmed members of non-episcopal congregations should be admitted to Holy Communion during the period of the planning of reunion, the bishops will have the support of all liberal-minded Churchpeople. They will have the support of the same opinion in their resolution that during the period of arrangement there should be no celebration of the Holy Communion in Anglican churches for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained, and that Anglican communicants should only receive the Sacraments at the hands of ministers of their own Church. These are points of the utmost importance, and emphasise the basis upon which the resolutions on reunion have been arrived at."

Prof. C. Anderson Scott, D.D., of Cambridge (Presbyterian), writes in *The British Weekly*, London, as follows:

"Perhaps the strangest thing about the Appeal is that, in spite of its 'address,' it so completely ignores all others but the 'authorities' or the ministers of our Churches. The one arrangement which it contemplates or suggests is an arrangement for facilitating 'intercelebration,' or reciprocal functioning of ministers in the Sacrament. We have never succeeded in getting our Anglican friends to understand that this is not a thing which any of us desires, probably not a thing which many of us would care to allow. What we have asked for, and what we do ask for, is the privilege in case of need, or when circumstances make it natural, of together partaking at the Table of our common Lord. We ask for it as a symbol, the most natural and the most obvious symbol, of that unity of the one Church which the bishops so frankly recognise. We ask for it as the best way of witnessing to the world that we are one in the Lord Jesus. We ask for it as the first step and the one hopeful step towards a completer union, should that be in accordance with the mind of God.

"On this matter, however, which touches us so deeply, the Lambeth resolutions show distinct retrogression. The distinct hardening of prac-

tice which has been manifest since 'Kikuyu' receives now for the first time, if we mistake not, authoritative sanction. The report of the committee on the subject would appear not to have been accepted; and in its stead we have what can only be described as the most guarded and grudging permission to admit 'unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations' 'in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union.' This would appear to be the one concrete result of the conference so far as reunion is concerned, and it fills us with sadness. And also with perplexity; for the bishops tell us that 'God wills fellowship.'

"The fact is that either we have been discussing the wrong things or we have failed to get the bishops to understand how entirely secondary for us are these things with which they deal in this appeal. They appear to think that all that is needed is to construct a bridge over which we can cross without the loss of self-respect or without incurring reproach from the outside world. It must be acknowledged that some of our own people have encouraged them in this fallacy, partly by allowing the discussion to harp perpetually on this question of reordination. It is perhaps not their fault that they cannot see that we could not cross such a bridge to form part of a sacerdotal Church without abandoning much treasure, without, as we think, impoverishing British Christianity in all its future."

The Living Church, Milwaukee, (Episcopal) says:

"In some respects they may be said to have adopted a new line of thought on this well-worn subject. They are certainly much more definite in their appeal. We can appreciate that it was with grave anxiety that some of the bishops cast their vote. Yet all the reports speak of the remarkable unanimity with which the pronouncements on unity were adopted. The fact that the Bishop of Zanzibar has reviewed the action most sympathetically in the *Church Times*, and the Bishop of Edinburgh equally so in the *Guardian*, bears witness that there is no hidden danger lurking somewhere in obscure language that can emerge to plague us in later days. We may say frankly that there are details that we should not be willing to incorporate in the law of the American Church, and there are obscurities in which only great wisdom in administration can prevent grave danger; yet on the whole we deem the action wise and statesmanlike beyond almost anything that has heretofore been set forth by the Anglican episcopate."

The Congregationalist, Boston, says:

"The spirit of this Appeal must commend it to thoughtful and prayerful consideration among all Christian people. It is not, like the famous Lambeth Quadrilateral, a statement of conditions without which unity is impossible. In its breadth of vision it includes the ancient communions of the East as well as the separate communions and Churches of Great Britain and America. It sets before us the vision of a universal Church which is the body of Christ, not now manifest, but to be manifested by an adventure with Christ Himself and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in recognition and brotherhood. It may become a step toward that ultimate attainment of federated unity which is the dream and desire of all true followers of Christ. We must be careful, therefore, lest any contemptuous or narrow word should prove a hindrance. We who have always believed in the Universal Church, in which each is united to Christ and through Christ each to all, must watch this new adventure in fellowship with sympathy and warm desire to aid."

A London correspondent of *The Christian Century*, Chicago, writes:

“They go much further than the most sanguine advocates of Christian unity had dared to expect, and reveal a clearer and more generous appreciation of the Free Church position and point of view than previous similar pronouncements from the same source. The membership of all Christians in the Church universal is frankly recognized. ‘We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body. The one body needs not to be made, nor to be remade, but to become organic and visible. The fellowship of the members of the one body exists. We have only to discover it and to set free its activities.’ No repudiation of past ministry is suggested. ‘Free Church ministers have been manifestly blessed and owned of the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. * * * God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessing for himself and others.’ Any idea of absorbing any one communion in another is likewise disavowed. ‘We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavor to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the body of Christ for which he prayed.’ The bishops’ advance is being met by Free Church leaders in a spirit of fraternity and responsiveness, the universal desire among Nonconformists being to go as far as possible toward meeting their brethren of the Anglican Church without the sacrifice of fundamental principle.”

The Manchester *Guardian*, (Free Church) says:

“There are signs already that the bishops’ Appeal for Christian union will be seriously and sympathetically received by the Free Churches. An authority on the Free Church side assured me to-day that in his opinion not a single denomination would refuse to take part in a conference between the bishops and Nonconformist leaders to explore the possibilities of practical action. It is thought that nothing but good would ensue if the Archbishop were to follow up the appeal by calling such a conference. The language of the appeal, with its moderation and generosity, is held to mark a great advance on earlier advances from the Anglican side. The Free Churches are no longer spoken of as ‘other Christian bodies;’ they are referred to as ‘the great non-episcopal Communion.’ Then there are the vitally important passages in the appeal assuring the other Churches that there is no wish to interfere with distinctive methods of worship, and saying that the only way to approach union is by ‘mutual deference to one another’s consciences.’ ”

A London correspondent in *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, (Episcopal) says:

“In the first place, it is evident that most Nonconformists who have expressed themselves as favorably disposed towards the bishops’ proposal have had in view but one aspect of the matter—that of home reunion—overlooking the fact that the scheme is of a universal character, and seeks to embrace not only Protestant Nonconformity but the Churches of the East and the Church of Rome also. Reading the report in the light of Protestant reunion only, it is conceivable that many Free Churchmen were puzzled by the offer of the bishops, in certain cases, to submit themselves to a conditional re-ordination if necessary. With the broader aspect in view, of reunion with the East and Rome, their lordships’ offer is per-

fectly comprehensible. The bishops are obviously convinced that no progress can be made until Nonconformists are willing to submit to episcopal ordination; it is certain that neither Rome nor the East would contemplate reunion on any other basis. Many Nonconformists are frankly hostile to any such suggestion; others view the proposal with misgivings. Even those who accept it appear to assume that the sacramental theory of the priesthood has been abandoned by the bishops. That this is not so, is made clear by the definite statement in the report that 'we (the bishops) regard ordination as conferring grace, and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office.'

"Although, as I have said, there are many Free Churchmen who regard the proposals as a whole with sympathy, it is useless to disguise the fact that there is a strong opposition. Principal Griffith Jones, a leading Nonconformist, claims, indeed, that the vast majority of Free Church ministers will never submit to conditions of reunion which include episcopal ordination and the Nicene Creed, and will accept no creed as authoritative which over-rides their own judgment and conscience. If this is so, it is manifestly impossible to include such thinkers in any scheme of real reunion, which must necessarily adopt a common creed. A Christian Church must stand to teach something authoritatively. Probably the outcome will be to continue the present friendly negotiations with the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and do all that is possible to be done in that direction, while leaving an 'open door' for the Protestants. Discouragement need not be felt, nor surprise that there is not an immediate and favorable response to the conference proposals. The non-episcopal bodies may yet recognize how far the bishops have gone to meet them, and will be brought to see that the cause of reunion is worth every sacrifice that does not involve a surrender of principle.

"From the Catholic point of view, it may be said that reunion stands out as the most momentous of the problems dealt with by the conference, and all good Churchmen will accord the proposals the most careful and respectful attention, with a profound sympathy for the high ideal which the bishops have set before themselves. There is a strong feeling, however, that the prospects of general acceptance of the scheme have been handicapped by simultaneously bringing forward the resolutions on the occasional interchange of pulpits (Resolution 12, A, i) and the ministrations of women (Resolution 52). These two proposals stand little chance of being accepted by Catholics in England, and their effect on the Eastern Orthodox Church will undoubtedly be to postpone reunion in that quarter.

"It may be mentioned, in connection with the resolutions concerning ministrations of women, that the Bishop of Zanzibar has given notice to his diocese that in the next session of his sacred synod he will advise them:

"(a) To ask him not to promulgate resolutions 52 (d) and 53 of the Lambeth Conference;

"(b) To help him to define quite strictly the sense in which the diocese expects him to interpret resolutions 46, 52 (a), and 12 A (i).

"The consideration of the Lambeth resolutions will undoubtedly arouse the greatest interest at the forthcoming Church Congress at Southend. The view of the Orthodox Churches on the reunion question will on that occasion be presented by Mr. Athelstan Riley, than whom no English Churchman is in closer touch with the opinions of Eastern ecclesiastics, nor better qualified to speak on their behalf."

The Roman Catholic opinion is expressed by the London *Tablet*, which is the leading British Roman Catholic journal, as follows:

“Three hundred millions of Catholics, the bulk of the Christian world, stand irreconcilably aloof—not, of course, because they do not yearn for Christian reunion, but because, as Catholics, they never could accept that notion of the Christian Church or that notion of Christian unity which, so far, is the only one which the Anglican bishops can afford to propose.”

Continuing the same journal says:

“As an abstract aspiration, no doubt, it was meant in all sincerity for all Christendom; but as a practical project they must have known that it had no chance of being considered by any except their fellow-Protestants, the Dissenters, for whom it was definitely intended, and who, we think, ought to be deeply grateful for the conciliatory concessions that have so generously been made to them. * * * * *

“We know, and rejoice to know, that in the Anglican and in the Dissenting bodies, as in the Lutheran and in the Calvinistic (as in the early Christian sects), there are multitudes of sincere and earnest souls who are pleasing to God by their honesty and their exemplary Christian lives. These groups of good Christians do not make the Church holding Christ’s authority to teach and sanctify the world. * * * It [such a scheme of reunion] would mean that she, the Church sent to teach all nations, was nothing more than a federation of sects—a Church, not Catholic, but conglomerate—a chaos and confusion of contradictory voices in which no man would have anything but his private judgment to tell him the true meaning of what his Saviour came to teach him. It is a concept of the Christian Church which is plainly characteristic of the Reformation in the later stage of its experience, and the product of Protestantism, hopeless in its efforts to unite its followers in doctrinal agreement, and yet unwilling to unchurch any who clung to Baptism and justifying faith in Christ. To a Catholic such a notion is irredeemably unworthy and repulsive.”

Another Roman Catholic journal, the *Columbus Josephinum Weekly*, says:

“Except that it provides an excellent opportunity for a number of aged clergymen in different parts of the world to take a pleasant holiday, and affords in addition a medium for getting numberless things off their minds, it is difficult to see what useful purpose the Lambeth Conference fulfils.”

The Christian World, London, (Free Church) writing of Dr. R. F. Horton’s sermon on the subject of the “Appeal,” says:

“In his view the Lambeth message is a real turning-point, a bridge between the episcopal and non-episcopal Churches. Instead of the old attitude of ‘You must submit,’ there was a new spirit of humility and gentleness, and a frank acknowledgment of the Free Churches as part of the Church of Christ. The response should be as reasonable, as humble, and as generous as the invitation. They should consider in a spirit of prayerful goodwill whether they could adopt the method proposed. After the service a conference was held, to which members of the Church of England were invited. The following resolution was passed:—

“That this conference urges upon the Free Church Council to endeavor to arrange at an early date a conference of representatives of the

non-episcopal religious bodies, the object of this conference to be to see if any practical basis can be found for giving expression to the spirit of the bishops' message or to form a reply to the same."

Rt. Rev. Philip M. Rhinelander, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa., a member of the Lambeth Conference, sums up the "Appeal" in these two well worded paragraphs which appeared in *The British Weekly*, London:

"It is not for me here to commend or explain our 'Appeal.' It must speak for itself. I would point out, however, wherein it seems to us who put it forth to say a new thing in a new way. It is obviously natural to contrast it with the 'Lambeth Quadrilateral.' That contrast really tells the story. For in the 'Quadrilateral' not a word is said about the Church. It is passed over in a silence which is not less significant because it is entirely unconscious. The Scriptures are mentioned, and next to them the creeds. Then come the Sacraments, and, following them, the ministry. But of the Church itself, to which the Scriptures and the creeds bear witness, for which the Sacraments and ministry exist, there is no hint. But of our new appeal the Church is the beginning and the ending. We are concerned with nothing else. Bible, Sacraments and ministry are certainly included and insisted on, but they are included in their due subordination and proportion. They are the means, the necessary and God-given means, to the paramount end of the whole Church's full continuous and indissoluble life. They are judged and valued, commended and vindicated, solely with that end in view.

"This notable change in emphasis signifies a corresponding change in outlook. In the 'Quadrilateral' we were Anglicans speaking to non-Anglicans. Our proposals were in the nature of a peace treaty between separate and self-sufficient groups. We set down our lowest terms, our minimum requirements for those who might desire to keep spiritual company with us. That was a clear and quite intelligible line to take, and we took it in all sincerity and truth. But now we have set our faces in quite another way. Now we speak, not as Anglicans to non-Anglicans, but as members of the Church Catholic to other members, all of us members who together have been made one by God's own act and grace in Jesus Christ, but who have on every side broken and frustrated that unity which was and is the highest gifts of our Father's love, and the most sure proof of His Self-revelation in His Son. The knitting together of the broken fragments of the Body according to His will so that we all together may know the fulness of our common heritage, the edification of the whole Fellowship in all its rich diversity of thought, character and temperament, so that 'all the nations may flow into it,' each bringing its peculiar differences and special gifts, and finding its home and sanctification in one family life, this aim and desire spoke in us and controlled us. It marked, for us at least, a new and deeply-moving purpose. It came with the authority of truth."

When the whole Church realizes that it is in a schismatic condition there will be a brightening hope of reconciliation. Concerning this *The Challenge*, London, (Anglican) says,

"The omens are propitious. In quite recent times there has been a remarkable convergence of opinion upon a new point of view, the adoption of which would bring the practical accomplishment of re-union immeasurably nearer. It had been customary for 'Catholics' to maintain that only societies constituted and organised in a certain way could be regarded as within the Catholic Church. Rome still adopts this attitude. But we hear less of the traditional Anglo-Catholic theory of three branches—the Roman, the Orthodox, the Anglican—as alone constituting the true Church. In its place we have the glad confession from many sides that there is only one Catholic Church and that the non-episcopalian bodies, as truly as the three 'branches,' are even now within it. This was the fundamental principle of the 'Mansfield Resolutions,' about which controversy lately raged. It has received endorsement from many quarters in which the immediate practical proposals of the Mansfield Conference were unacceptable. It provides a new starting point. It does not involve those who accept it in any abandonment of their own convictions with regard to the order necessary to be preserved and maintained in the re-united Church of the future, but it does save any proposals from being or even appearing to be an invitation from one body to others that they should join it. If Anglicans adopt this principle, we shall not invite Congregationalists (for instance) to join the Anglican Communion, but we shall invite them to consider with us how we may join together to form the re-united Church. For this principle involves the confession that there is no one outward society from which others are in schism, and that we are all schismatics together."

The proposed concordat between the Anglican, Eastern Orthodox and old Catholic Churches is receiving some interesting comments in the Protestant Episcopal circles in America. Rt. Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Southern Virginia, writes to *The Southern Churchman*, Richmond, Va., as follows:

"As a member of the Joint Commission to confer with Eastern Orthodox Churches and Old Catholics, I wish to make, through your courtesy, the following statement:

"It was with great regret that I had to decline the earnest and courteous invitation of the Bishop of Harrisburg to accompany the members of the commission to Europe. I was not present at the meeting of the commission last winter, as the notification did not reach me, and therefore the Preliminary Statement was not seen by me until this week.

"I have the highest respect for the members of the commission and recognize their ability and their pure consecration to the cause of Christian unity. In both the Preliminary Statement and the Proposed Terms of Agreement, however, there are expressed positions which I cannot take conscientiously with my sense of loyalty to the Church of which I am a member.

"I find myself unable to disagree with the definition, and what I feel to be the limitation of the number of Sacraments given in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles of our own Church.

"I cannot join in the apology, which is made in the Preliminary Statement of the American Commission, for the English reformation, nor share the regret expressed for the Protestant atmosphere in which the Anglican Church was compelled to set forth its liturgy and its foundation of doctrine. Nor can I share in the hope that in the near future, when 'the Cath-

olic movement of which the Tractarian movement beginning in 1833 is an example,' has reached its zenith, the Church will be thoroughly de-protestanized. Nor am I ready to accept the decrees of the seventh council and to lend my sanction to the worship of relics and icons.

For these reasons I have cabled to the chairman of the commission not to sign my name as a member of the commission, to either the Preliminary Statement or the Terms of Agreement. I do not desire to enter into controversy. For my associates on the commission I have a feeling of affection and sympathy in their desire to promote Christian unity. Their judgment may be better than mine, but I am compelled to follow my convictions and do my duty as God seems by His Holy Spirit to indicate it to me. I shall reserve the right to express my views, as a member of the commission, when its report is presented to the General Convention."

That journal commenting editorially says,

"A committee or commission of the General Convention of many years standing, to confer with officials of the Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Old Catholics, has drawn up certain Terms of Agreement as a proposed 'Basis of Restoration of Corporate Unity and Intercommunion.' This proposed Concordat has been accepted, we are informed, by Bishop Herzog, of the Old Catholics, and by several dignitaries of the Armenian Church, and has been 'cordially received' by a Synod of Greek and Russian ecclesiastics at Athens, whose formal reply, however, has not yet been published. It is this paper, with its 'Preliminary Statement' of our Committee, to which Bishop Tucker, of Southern Virginia, refers."

The Protestant section referred to is as follows:

"We have been informed from time to time that the Orthodox Easterns have some difficulty in reconciling certain Protestant aspects of our position and policy with full and genuine orthodoxy—in particular the phraseology of some of our *Articles of Religion*, the laxity of our discipline towards certain Protestant errors, and the existence, even among many of our clergy, of opinions inconsistent with loyalty to the catholic faith and order. For a right understanding of these things care should be taken to allow for the peculiar and providential mission of the Anglican Churches.

"When the English reformation took place, those who threw off the papal supremacy were driven by serious corruption in the lives and administration of the prelates of that day to radical reaction against the system which they administered; and they often failed to distinguish between necessary elements of Christian faith and order and the corruptions with which they were overlaid. The English Church alone among those who at that time abandoned the papal rule succeeded in retaining the catholic ministry and sacraments, and the faith which goes with them. But this Church was beset by earnest efforts both from within and from without to go further in the Protestant direction. Accordingly, while the English Church retained its catholic heritage, it did so under great difficulties, and with the necessity of dealing kindly and tactfully with those who were impatient and wished to go further. The policy of conformity was adopted. That is, the *Prayer Book* was set forth, embodying the catholic working system, but in forms and language which it was hoped would retain the loyalty of those impatient souls. To make their conformity easier the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* were adopted as an eirenicon or peace-making platform. In these Articles Protestant feelings were allowed for, and as many things as possible were said in terms that would be pleasing to them, which explains the Protestant flavor that some of these Articles show. But close examination of them,

and of the use of language in that troublesome period, will prove that great care was taken to avoid any statement contrary to the catholic faith and order. These are indeed inserted in them. It should be said in this connection that in our Article XIX, wherein the possibility of particular Churches falling into error is illustrated by examples of erring Churches, the Church of Constantinople is not included. Its orthodoxy was plainly recognized by the framers of the Articles. The Protestants were not satisfied, and so arose the dissenting denominations in England, and their subsequent appearance in America and the British Colonies. The political association of the Church with an unpopular crown in England had much to do with this result, so that Anglicans have felt partly responsible, and believe that it is their duty by all means to win Protestants back to the Church.

“Accordingly, our discipline has always been tender and sympathetic in that direction, and we are indisposed to drive out these among ourselves who fail to realize the fulness of their catholic heritage, lest we alienate Protestants altogether and thus end all hope of winning them. This policy has worked as well as could reasonably be expected. Those who fully and loyally adhere to the *Prayer Book* working system do become more and more consistently catholic and every revival of loyalty to this working system results in what is called a ‘catholic movement’ of which the Tractarian movement beginning in 1833 is an example. And each new movement of this kind is more gratifying in its catholic results than its predecessors.

The sum of the matter is that our history establishes the catholic nature and tendency of our position and system; and the seemingly lax aspects of conditions show merely that we are adhering to the great work of helping Protestants to recover what they have lost.”

A part of the section referring to the honors paid to relics, images and pictures says,

“With regard to the councils that have been accepted as ecumenical subject to an explanation by the Anglicans which is accepted as satisfactory by the Easterns and by the Old Catholics, we agree in accepting seven councils as truly ecumenical, viz., those of Nicea, 325 A. D., Constantinople, 381 A. D., Ephesus, 431 A. D., Chalcedon, 451 A. D., Constantinople, 553 A. D., Constantinople, 680-681 A. D., and Nicea, 787 A. D. The explanations referred to are as follows:

In view of an impression of many English speaking Christians that the decree on image worship set forth by the council of Nicea, 787 A. D., which sanctions prostrations, *προσκύνησις* [proskunesis], before images, is equivalent to a sanction of such adoration as is unlawful when paid to a creature, we, the Anglicans, do not feel justified in accepting that council as ecumenical without explanation, and without assurance from the Easterns and Old Catholics that our explanation is satisfactory. The Anglican manner of showing honor differs from that of the Eastern in confining such ceremony as *προσκύνησις* to acts of adoration or *λατρεία* [latreia]. We do use and honor representations of Christ and His saints, but in less ceremonious ways. Therefore it would be misleading and contrary to any meaning that the Eastern Christians and Old Catholics would wish to maintain if we should without explanation describe the relative honor which we regard as lawfully paid to relics, images, or pictures by the term *προσκύνησις* or its literal equivalent, ‘prostration’.

“In accepting the seventh ecumenical council, therefore, we feel it to be our duty to explain that we interpret and accept its decree as commending no higher honor to be paid to relics, images, or pictures than is involved in

using them as creaturely adjuncts of devotion to God. All adoration or *latreia* being due exclusively to the Divine Being."

The Southern Churchman defends Bishop Tucker's position as follows:

* * * "In the 'Preliminary Statement' also of our commission to confer, etc., is a long section of 'Our relations with Protestants' which is little more than an abject apology for the Protestant position of this Church as set forth in her articles of Religion and Book of Common Prayer and for her 'tender and sympathetic' attitude towards Protestants within as well as without her fold. It is altogether the crudest and most partisan presentation we have ever seen from a body of men claiming in any way officially to speak for the Anglican Churches."

Of Bishop Tucker's attitude, *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis., (Episcopal) says,

"That the bishop has deemed this divergence from the view presented by the commission so weighty as to justify him in cabling his refusal to allow his name to be used among the signatures to the papers is a matter for keen regret. A signature to a formal document does not imply indorsement in every detail, or complete satisfaction with language used, but rather a general acquiescence; there could be joint signatures to a few reports on difficult subjects if more were involved. In connection with the bishop's comments there is not one in which his position would seem to us to make it impossible for him to sign the document as it is expressed, not one in which his view may be held to have been excluded from the Anglican position as stated by the commission. He has the right to demand that that position be so stated as to comprehend himself and his theological associates; he is not justified in demanding that it be so stated as to comprehend nobody else. His use of the three mooted words is a legitimate use. It is not the only legitimate use of them. It would be absurd to demand that Greeks abandon their use and accept his, when theirs has at least as many centuries of authority behind it as has his own."

The Congregationalist, Boston, says,

"An announcement of unusual importance in the field of the union of the Churches is made by a commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church and printed in full in *The Living Church*. It is a concordat drawn up and presented by that commission to the Old (not Roman) Catholic and the Oriental (Orthodox) Churches, Greek, Russian and Armenian. Bishop Herzog, of the Old Catholic Church, signed it for that Church in Switzerland over which he presides. It was later signed by the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople and the Vicar Apostolic of the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem. And it was submitted to the Synod at Athens of the Greek and Russian (Orthodox) Churches, the synod appointing a commission, which agreed that a confederation of the Churches might be made immediately, though further steps would be necessary for a formal union. Such a union would give nearly a world-wide Church, the Old Catholics being sparsely scattered on the European continent in the strongholds of the Papal Roman Catholic Church.

“The concordat traverses the doctrinal, liturgical and governmental points at issue between the Churches directly concerned, meeting some debated question by complete agreement and explaining differences of tradition and usage and of points of view for others, while referring the ancient moot point between East and West of the ‘procedure’ of the Holy Spirit ‘from the Father,’ or from the ‘Father and the Son’ to an ecumenical council hoped for later. As to the question whether there are two or seven Sacraments, the difference of opinion and usage is avoided by a re-definition of the word ‘Sacrament’ which makes a special place for the two (of Baptism and the Supper) and leaves the five (confirmation, penance, holy order, holy matrimony and holy unction) as ‘Means of grace bestowed by the Holy Spirit’ and in that wider sense sacramental. The question of prostration before relics, pictures and images is also met by definition and allowance. Acceptance of the validity of the sacraments administered by any of the communions and intercommunion are thus led up to and accepted.

“What concerns us most directly in these steps toward a union of the Eastern, Old Catholic and Anglican Churches is the explanatory statement of the Protestant Episcopal Commission which took the initiative in this approach and tentative agreement. The commission sketches the history of previous attempts to bring together these separated communions and then goes on to the historical statement that while the English Church at the reformation ‘Retained its catholic heritage, it did so under great difficulties, and with the necessity of dealing kindly and tactfully with those who were impatient and wished to go further in the Protestant direction.’

“We would not lay a straw in the way of such a reunion of communion as this concordat contemplates. That is entirely for the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, lay and clerical, and of all schools of thought to decide. But there is much in the concordat itself which would make it more difficult than ever for the Congregational Churches to enter into an agreement with the Protestant Episcopal Church which would in any wise commit them to some of the views of worship, Church authority and traditions outlined in this proposed union of Churches.”

The Southern Churchman, Richmond, Va., drops this wise word regarding patience in Christian unity,

It took about twelve centuries for the sordid ambitions, the short-sighted enthusiasms and narrow-minded policies of Christian men, aided by the political machinations of the world, to bring the Church of Christ into the disorganized and chaotic condition in which it now finds itself, with its consequent impotency and failure of trust. It is only about fifty years that a considerable element in the Church has been looking for the way out of this awful muddle and for the healing of these deadly ruptures in the body of Christ. Is it a wonder that in so short a time the whole Church has not been brought even to a sincere desire for unity, much less to an agreement as to how this ancient and deep-seated evil is to be cured? It has been so long lost sight of that not the wisest of us knows what organic union will be like when it comes. Age-long and world-wide errors are not corrected in a day. Only one greater mistake can be made than to suppose that unity is coming very soon, and that would be to despair of its coming at all.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DIFFICULTIES TO FREEDOM

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:—I am asked to write about the problem of Christian unity, but what shall I write? I am asked to be free, but how free am I to be? Freedom is a very indefinite term. To define its limitations is difficult. If as a Congregationalist I should be free in rambling through the fields of Congregationalism but dared to include in my freedom the endorsement of the concordat and affirm therewith that I was awaiting ordination by the Episcopal bishops as soon as the General Convention had passed the disputed canon, I would have scores of Congregationalists whacking me over the head for my departure from Congregational tradition. If as an Episcopalian I should exercise my freedom in inviting non-episcopal clergymen into my pulpit the bishop of my diocese would be calling me to account and great numbers of Episcopalians would charge me with violation of the vows of my ordination and desecrating the pulpit of the Church. If as a Disciple I should be so free in advocating those things for which the Disciples stand I would be hailed by them as a champion of their traditions. But if on the other hand I should use my freedom on the matters of Baptism, receiving into full membership in my church those who had been baptized by sprinkling or pouring, there would be an uprising among many of those Disciple churches that hold exclusively to membership on Baptism by immersion only. I might go down the list of all the Churches and the fact is that so long as I maintained the tradition of that peculiar Church I would be regarded as their champion; but when I attempted to follow the passion of a larger freedom, the member who sees only through the keyhole of his own sect, and usually the keyhole that opens into the back yard of his own premises, would charge me with being an unfaithful upstart.

Now the family of that member is larger than the family of those who are seeking for freedom. A test vote would give him the majority. It would put me in the minority. I think this would be true regarding the ministry in particular. I am wondering whether it would be true regarding the masses of Church membership. Scores of people in the Churches are wearied with the policy the ministry is trying to put over on them. Talking to a group of ministers recently they expressed the opinion that they were unwilling for the people to decide this question, for they were sure the people would bolt the traditional methods. The the question is whether the time has not come for the people to do some thinking for themselves. The ministry is now divided. They cannot get together on very many things. The chief reason for this is that they have been taught those attitudes that necessarily keep them apart, but the ministry is frequently wrong. I think the war illustrated one of the greatest errors in the thought of the modern ministry that has been revealed in the whole history of the church. Because the war in all countries touched off a universal explosion of patriotic enthusiasm and men and women everywhere willingly worked for war interests, the ministry concluded that that enthusiasm was religion and most of the ministers took the illusion that the nations were undergoing a moral, ennobling experience. To have talked otherwise was regarded as both unpatriotic and unwise. The ministry appeared to have been entirely unacquainted with the facts of history as well as human experience, which show that every war has been followed by a period of moral apathy and exhaustion. The result of this ministerial illusion has been that great numbers of men have left the ministry for

mercantile pursuits and likewise great numbers of laymen have shown a marked indifference in Church affairs. If the ministry that has been trained to interpret God drops wholesale and pell-mell into such an illusion in a manner so manifest, is it not time for the ministry to take its reckoning regarding other matters that are just as vital as this?

Jesus Christ came to make men free. The slavery of tradition is the most difficult servitude from which to be freed in human history. To think as one's father thought, to think as one's community thinks, to think as one's denomination thinks cannot be accepted as final. Jesus stands out as the first freeman of mankind. He took issue with the traditions of the past, whether they were incorporated in the Scriptures or not. Every man seeking for freedom must be equally fearless in freeing himself from the traditions of his Church and other Churches, traditions of his community and other communities or his nation and other nations, unless those traditions conform to the great principles embodied in Jesus Christ.

I recognize that a man can abuse his freedom and go to as dangerous and hurtful extreme as the man who nurses his slavery in holding all of his traditions with divine sacredness. There is a middle ground and it is the middle ground that we as ministers of reconciliation are to find and hold. On that ground is to be maintained coöperation, orderliness, toleration, long suffering, gentleness, selfcontrol and love. Whatever may be the attitudes of men, so these principles predominate rather than the principles incorporated in the traditions of a denomination or those incorporated in the traditions of a community, there will cease to be these closed corporations, for such is every modern denomination. This is no little undertaking and many a member of a denomination would hold the way it does things on an equality with the way God is trying to do things. I sometimes think we have got to discover that much of our way of doing things is the highmindedness and stubbornness of man in undoing and thwarting the handiwork of God.

I dropped into a minister's library and after going over his books I found there books by Roman Catholics and by Protestants of nearly every denomination. I asked him if he made use of all these books and he answered with some surprise, "Of course I do." I then said, "You mean to say you use these to help you preach?" He said, "Certainly." Then I said, "You use these to help you preach, but you do not associate with those denominations to help you live. If you use the books of all these denominations to help you preach, are you not under obligation to help all these denominations from which you make quotations by speaking in friendly terms of them and giving them a fair chance to show to you and your people the trust that they hold?" He did not seem to see that one necessarily followed the other. The difficulty with us is we are still going around selecting something here and something there that suits our notions, making a kind of crazy-quilt, when if we practiced fellowship with souls as well as with books we could receive such soul enrichment as would help us to a larger freedom in the service to our fellows and in the work of God.

Yours truly,

ANTHONY OPENEYE.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Being the Bampton Lectures for the Year 1920. By the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. John Murray, Albemarle St., W. 1, London.

THIS book will command the attention of the thoughtful for years to come. It is the fulfilment of a design which Dr. Headlam has carried for more than thirty years. It is a book of real merit in that it is scholarly, being true to the facts, free without being radical, logical in most instances, and an argument of unusual power. Its method is primarily historical, examining the evidence and drawing conclusions accordingly. He plunges into his subject in the opening lecture with the statement of the British Army in France being denied Roman Catholic Church buildings for the service of the troops and the Church of England chaplains in France refusing communion to pious members of the Presbyterian and Nonconformist Churches on the eve of battle, illustrating the evils of a divided Christendom, and then through the eight lectures he speaks with such freedom that the whole horizon of one's thinking is lighted up with the possibilities of that Christian charity which Augustine so frequently emphasized and which he manifested in his dealings with the Donatists.

The eight lectures are divided as follows: "The Origins of the Church," going back for the sources of the Church into Judaism, especially emphasizing the significance of the word *ecclesia* and its later use in the Gospels, the significations of the term Kingdom of Heaven, the place of Discipleship, Apostolate, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, etc.; "The Apostolic Church," finding his authorities in the Acts of the Apostles and the Apostolic Epistles, and dealing there with the teaching of the Apostles regarding Baptism, Communion, appointment of the seven, missionary ministers, authority of the Twelve, position of St. Peter, laying on of hands, confirmation, unity of the Church, the ministry, living power of the Church, etc.; "The Catholic Church," emphasizing the distinction between the Catholic Church, which was the Church before divisions occurred, and the Roman Catholic Church, which is the Latin Church of the eleventh century and on, and giving an account of the changes in the Church, the development of monarchical episcopacy, meaning of the word Church, its principles and ministry, constitutional position of a bishop, theories of orders, etc.; "The Teaching of St. Augustine," including the influence of his thought on theology, his arguments against the Donatists, the nature of the Christian ministry, the Church and Christian charity, etc.; "The Divisions of the Church," including the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies, schism of East and West, the *filioque* clause, claims of the Papacy, the Medieval Church, the Reformation, Council of Trent, etc.; "The Doctrine of the Church—I," emphasizing the teaching of the creed, catholicity, unity of the Church, Roman solution, Protestant view, meaning of schism, authority and merits of the creed,

etc.; "The Doctrine of the Church—II," emphasizing the authority and value of episcopacy, valid ordination, meaning of orders, apostolic succession, recognition of non-episcopal orders, episcopacy and episcopal ordination necessary for unity, causes of division, etc.; "Reunion," emphasizing the right attitude of mind, inadequacy of federations, wrong methods of approach, recognition of other episcopal churches and non-episcopal churches, unity without uniformity, need of reconciliation, etc. This is only a scant and imperfect survey of the book.

Dr. Headlam speaks at times with astonishing frankness and so true to the facts that he awakens confidence and holds it to the close of the volume. He has dropped seed thoughts, like Newman, who made possible the Modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church, a fact which many perhaps would deny, and like Augustine, who sowed the seeds which made possible both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The Oxford professor has so presented his thought that to the free and thoughtful it shows that forms of Church government, not even episcopacy, are of such vital consequence as to keep the Church apart, and opens the way to the removal of one of the age long contentions of the Church. He, however, holds to episcopacy as the organ of unity. He does not prove that it is such an organ. He affirms it with a devotion that indicates his reverence for this ancient order of Church government, although he likewise affirms that no one of the rival systems of Church polity which prevail at the present time—Episcopacy, Papacy, Presbyterianism or Congregationalism—can find any direct support in the Bible, nor is it possible to trace the process and stages of the development of episcopal ordination. He says, "The only practical policy for reunion will be based on the mutual recognition of orders. We know what our feelings are in the Church of England; we will certainly have nothing to do with the Church of Rome unless Rome is prepared to recognize our orders. It is exactly the same with the Eastern Church. If they were to come to us and say that our orders were invalid or doubtful, and that a condition of reunion would be that our clergy should be reordained, do you suppose that we should pay any attention to them? If that be so, cannot we understand that that may be exactly the position in regard to the Presbyterians? Do you suppose that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland would accede to any proposals for reunion unless we were prepared to recognize the validity of their orders and ministry? And that recognition would have to be mutual."

Regarding the Eucharist, which he treats with due reverence, he says, "The great mistake that the Christian Church has made from the Middle Ages to the present day is to have attempted to define dogmatically what no human language can define and what it has never been intended that the Church should define, and we shall never end our many troubles concerning the Eucharist until we have been willing to dispense entirely with definitions; and this I would say not intending to depreciate or lower our Eucharist worship. Definition does not explain; it limits and curtails." This is finely said. But the same argument applies to Jesus Christ, Whom the creeds have sought to define, especially the Nicene Creed, whose early history Dr. Headlam rightly says is somewhat doubtful. If we should hesi-

tate to define the institution which Christ established, how much more hesitancy ought there to be in defining Christ Himself? And has not the attempt to make these definitions the test of Christian fellowship been one of the chief causes of disunion? There must be a creed. There can be no Church without a creed, but the creed should be in the Person Jesus Christ, as in Apostolic times, rather than in a definition of the Person, which limits the Person and is a subject of constant controversy. The Nicene Creed did not hold the Church together and its terms of expression are too archaic to hold it together now. It appears to be more reasonable to find the way to unity by faith in and loyalty to Jesus Christ around whom the early Church was a united body. There is no necessity of "wiping the slate and starting afresh," which Dr. Forsyth says is impossible. Quite so. Jesus Christ, who has been in His Church through all ages, alone gives to us the sense of historical continuity. The ancient creeds can be retained by those who desire them without the slightest molestation, but as a basis of reunion it raises another question.

In Dr. Headlam's holding to the kinder side of human nature, he has opened new routes of travel for those who are concerned for the will of God in the unity of His Church. Dr. Headlam's contribution must rank by the side of the best thought on the subject of reunion.

THE HISTORY OF THE FOREIGN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY. By Archibald McLean, President. Illustrated. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

THE record of foreign missionary work is always fascinating. This volume is no exception to that rule. Dr. McLean's long presidency of the Society, whose achievements he recites in these more than four hundred pages, has made him one of the foremost authorities in foreign missionary activities. He traces the origin of this Society from its humble beginning in 1875 to its present strength, with stations in nearly every nation on the globe. It is a story of a great mission and the author's passion for the whole world to have the knowledge of Jesus Christ is clothed in such finely worded sentences that it awakens like passion in the hearts of those who peruse the pages of this important volume in missionary annals. The time is coming when all missionary work in foreign countries will have to be done under a general board. That time already is and we look for its realization in the quickening activities of missionary work. The converts to Christianity have little interest in the things that separate Christians in America and Europe and the likelihood is they will have less as time goes on, which means that from the foreign missionary field we are to get our finest inspiration for permanent unity. This volume is a help to that end.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.



"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

JANUARY, 1921

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK



ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. X. JANUARY, 1921 No. 3

CONTENTS

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE LAMBETH APPEAL . . .	169
By Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot, D.D., Bishop of Bethlehem	
THE BASES OF UNITY	179
By Rev. Gaius Glenn Atkins, D.D., Minister First Congregational Church, Detroit, Mich.	
DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND ITS EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS	188
Being the Action of the Recent Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America.	
THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIAN PEACE	201
Being the Encycle of Pope Benedict XV.	
AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE WORLD'S WAITING AND OUR TARRYING	211
Being Addressed to the Editor by Anthony Openeye.	
EDITORIAL:	
FOURTH QUADRENNIAL MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL . .	215
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY .	220
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	230
AMONG NEW BOOKS	236

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

Week of Prayer for the Churches, January 2-8, 1921, January the 4th being in the interest of Christian unity.

At the instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity a series of Christian unity conferences in America are being arranged. The first will be in St. Louis, February 2-4, 1921, at the Second Baptist Church. The causes presented will be the World Conference on Faith and Order, the American Council on Organic Union of Protestants, the Lambeth Appeal, the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

There will be a similar conference in Dallas, Texas, the week following.

For particulars write the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Pentecost Sunday has been named by both the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

PETITION:

FOR blessing upon all who have confessed Jesus as Lord and Saviour.

FOR blessing upon all coöperative movements looking toward unity.

FOR blessing upon editors, authors and speakers whose thoughts contribute toward brotherhood.

Ask, and it shall be given to you: seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened to you. For, every one that asketh, receiveth: and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. For what man is there among you, of whom if his son ask bread, will he reach him a stone? Or if he ask of him a fish, will he reach him a serpent? If ye, then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father Who is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him.—Matt. 7:7-11 (Syriac).

The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears (ready) to hear them: but the face of the Lord is against the wicked.—1 Peter 3:12 (Syriac).

O Lord, perfect, we beseech Thee, the faith of us who believe, and sow the good seed of faith in their hearts who as yet lack it; that we all may look steadfastly unto Thee, and run with patience the race that is set before us. Give us grace to show our faith by our works; teach us to walk by faith, having respect unto the promises: which of Thy mercy make good to us in Thine own good time, O our most gracious Lord God and Saviour. Amen.

—*Christina G. Rosetti.*

In the Church of Jesus Christ the whole is far greater than the sum of its parts. The future of religion shall not always be endangered by suspicion and intolerance and narrowness among professed disciples of truth. It is permissible to hope for more union than exists at present among professing Christians and among the branches of the Christian Church. In spite of legitimate differences on difficult and infinite problems, there must be a mass of fundamental material on which a great majority are really agreed.

—*Sir Oliver Lodge.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL
RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMAN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church,
Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Canon of Westminster, London, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price \$2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF
THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
FOR OCTOBER, 1920

AN APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE. (LAM- BETH)	89
SCOTTISH CHURCH REUNION. BY ROBERT FORGAN	94
PRIEST OR PROPHET? A QUESTION FOR THE DAY. BY W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS	105
A PILGRIMAGE TOWARDS UNITY. BY CHARLES H. BRENT	117
THE DISCIPLES' PROGRAMME FOR UNION. BY GEORGE W. BROWN	121
EDITORIAL: THREE OUTSTANDING CONFERENCES . .	129
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY	140
LETTER TO THE EDITOR	156
BOOK REVIEWS	158

A PRAYER

Ⓘ LORD, be Thou patient with us in our loyalty to our opinions and traditions, which so frequently is disloyalty to Thee. Grant that we may see the truth as it is in Jesus. Forgive our self-will, teach us through suffering the way to brotherhood and lead us by the shadow of the cross into perfect submission, for Thou alone art the way, the truth and the life. In finding Thee we have found the fellowship that is to break all fellowships until there shall be one flock as there is one Shepherd, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE REMEMBRANCE OF CHRIST

AND so, when it became clear that He was going to be taken from them, on the night before He died, when too it must have seemed that it was all a failure except for His own obedience to His Father's will, and that all His effort had been thrown away—for what distressed Him most of all was that His closest friends, on whom everything must now depend, and who He had hoped would carry on His work, had failed to penetrate His mind; you remember that they were contending, on the night before He died, as regards their precedence in His Kingdom—on that night He made a last appeal. He asked them very simply to remember Him, and He suggested that they could do so best by sharing in a common meal at which He said that they would all be one, because they would all share in Him, the Body broken and the Blood outpoured. He thought too, that this might help them to be like Him, and might make them wish to go out into the world and do His work, the work which He had hoped to do; so that perhaps it might turn out after all that His great work had not been thrown away; that men might even yet believe that God had sent Him; and that they might realise how, in spite of great difficulty, very great difficulty, He had all along most dearly loved.—*R. H. Lightfoot, from a sermon recently preached in Westminster Abbey.*

Missionary Work Balked

All of the missionary work of the world is balked because of divisions in the Church. Divisions must be removed if the missionary cause would advance. It is not a matter of choice; it is an impelling necessity.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE LAMBETH APPEAL

I HAVE been requested to give an interpretation of the Appeal on reunion to all Christian people issued by the 252 bishops, assembled at the Lambeth Conference in London last July, 1920.

May I say in the first place that the Lambeth Conference has no legislative functions, and its resolutions and recommendations therefore must be ratified by the various national Churches and dioceses, before they become effective. What the Conference recommends however would naturally carry great weight throughout the Church, as the bishops come from all sections of the Anglican Communion scattered throughout the world.

It is true that both the secular and religious press of America at the time published the Appeal and commented upon it more or less fully. More recently attention has been drawn to it by the published opinions of many prominent, religious leaders, both in England and America. Notwithstanding, a certain measure of publicity thus given to this declaration of the bishops, it is still true that comparatively few American Christians have had an opportunity to study or even to read the Appeal. This may be said both of the clergy and laity on this side of the Atlantic. Moreover, there are many persons who have derived from the newspapers a very inadequate, if not entirely mistaken, view of what was actually set forth in the statement. It has seemed wise, therefore, before attempting anything in the way of a commentary on the Appeal, that it should be presented fully to the readers of *THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY*,* thus giving them an opportunity to form their own opinions as well as to judge more intelligently as to the correctness of any explanations I may feel disposed to offer.

*The Appeal was published in full in the October number of *THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY*.

How wide-spread and unusual an interest has been aroused in England upon the subject may be understood by the simple statement that in a recent copy of the *Church Family Newspaper*, of London, six columns of short communications from prominent Free Church ministers appear. The recommendations of the bishops are heartily endorsed by every one of these various writers belonging to many denominations. Dr. Scott Lidgett refers to the bishop's Appeal on the reunion of Christendom as, "the greatest ecclesiastical event since the Reformation;" and the Rev. F. B. Meyer, ex-secretary of the Free Church Council, says it is a "triumph of Christian statesmanship."

May I remind the reader that the Appeal received an almost unanimous approval from the 252 bishops present, and that only four among the entire number dissented. When it is considered how many differences of opinion have been entertained among the bishops on this anxious problem of Christian reunion, and that schools of thought which have been strongly opposed to each other were all brought to enthusiastic agreement, as here set forth, it will not be surprising that we felt that a power beyond our own had influenced and guided us.

It ought also to be stated that the wide-spread and almost pathetic need of reunion among Christians has long been felt by the bishops, and that they came to the Conference with a strong and solemn conviction that the time had fully come when some positive step, far in advance of anything hitherto attempted by us, would have to be made, if, in any measure, we should rise to the responsibility which a sadly divided Church presented to our minds and consciences. In other words, the condition of the Christian world, so important to bear witness for righteousness while its forces were kept asunder, had created an atmosphere among us entirely congenial to a prayerful consideration of reunion.

What the bishops now propose as a basis of reunion does not differ so much from previous positions in substance as in the method and spirit in which they approach the question. It is unnecessary to say that these proposals neither involve any change in our fundamental principles nor do they make any demand on the conscientious convictions of our brethren of other Churches now separated from us.

The committee appointed to consider the subject of reunion was the largest of all the committees of the Conference, and consisted of over seventy members. The chairman was the Archbishop of York, the most Reverend Cosmo G. Lang, D.D., who made this statement about himself, "I was born, brought up, and baptized in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. I was received into the Episcopal Church, and am now an archbishop. I should esteem it a privilege and an added consecration, and of course no repudiation of my Orders, if our relations with the Presbyterian Church were such that I could now receive such ordination or commission from the Church of my fathers as would enable me to minister in the Presbyterian Church, and to administer the Lord's Supper to its people; and I should feel that no Presbyterian minister would repudiate his ministry, if he should receive ordination at my hands, and while still remaining a minister of the Presbyterian Church, be able to administer the Lord's Supper in the Church of England." I quote these words of our chairman chiefly because they throw light on both the spirit and method of the Appeal which I have been asked to interpret and make it, if possible, more fully understood by readers of *THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY*.

Of the seventy or more bishops on our committee twelve of us were American bishops. When our Appeal was formally reported back to the whole body of bishops, together with the resolutions, for their consideration, we

hardly dared to hope that it would meet with any such welcome as it actually received. When, therefore, after much discussion and careful consideration, it was adopted with practical unanimity, the result was followed by the singing of the doxology and an ever memorable manifestation of devout thanksgiving for what clearly seemed to us as the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who maketh men to be of one mind within a house.

During our consideration of the subject, we called to our aid and associated with us a number of distinctive representatives of the Free Churches who gladly gave us the benefit of their experience and wisdom and whose interest in the subject was well known. Among these may be mentioned Dr. J. H. Shakespeare of the Baptist Church and many others.

While the above appeal has in mind our relations to other historical Churches possessing the episcopal form of government, it will be readily seen that it largely concerns itself with our brethren of the non-episcopal Churches in this country and in England, "standing for rich elements for truth, liberty and life. With them we are closely linked by many affinities racial, historical, and spiritual.

In the first paragraph the bishops express the sense of responsibility which rests upon them at this crisis of the world's history and of the sympathy and prayers of many Christian people within and without our own communion, who, like ourselves, are deeply interested in the question of the reunion of the visible Body of Christ.

In the second paragraph we make the declaration that we acknowledge that all who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized in the Name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are full members with us in the Holy Catholic or Universal Church of Christ which is His Body.

This declaration while not new, has been received by

many with evident surprise and expressions of great gratification. It means of course that Baptism is the divinely appointed means of admission to the Church, and that there is but one Church upon earth consisting of all baptized believers. There is therefore, we thankfully declare, already existing a spiritual unity of all Christian people, and the one great goal for which we are now striving and praying is that this spiritual unity should become manifested in a visible body so that its witness and influence may be felt.

We then express our belief that God wills fellowship; that it is His purpose to manifest this fellowship in an outward, visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is the meaning of the Catholic or Universal Church. Men are not to rest content with simply a spiritual unity or fellowship. It must manifest itself in the world by means of an outward, visible and united society. We deplore the fact that this fellowship at present is not visible, but as a matter of fact, we are now all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship and tending to live its own life apart from the rest. The sad fact of our numerous and our unhappy divisions is too obvious to require comment. We can only deplore it and pray for the removal of its causes. While these causes of division lie deep in the past, yet none will deny that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the process, and that these together with blindness to the sin of division are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We declare, as all good Christians unite with us in declaring, that this condition of broken fellowship is contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our own share in the guilt of

thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

We believe that the times call us to a new outlook and new measures. We feel that it is wrong to rest content with this condition of division in the Body of Christ; for the faith cannot be adequately apprehended, and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the Body is thus divided and unable to grow up into the fullness of the life of Christ. We believe that the time has come for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship "all who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Churches now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. I understand this to mean that the questions of liturgical or non-liturgical prayers, of vestments for ministers, and of forms and ceremonies in general will be left entirely to the free choice of the respective communions. These things are not fundamental, but are purely matters of taste and custom. To those of us accustomed to them they are very dear, but in a reunited Church there will be no thought of imposing them upon others. In other words a dead uniformity in such practices is not only impossible, but undesirable. Here the widest liberty will be expected. It is believed that only through a rich diversity of life and devotion can the unity of the whole fellowship be fulfilled.

This means of course an adventure of good-will, and

still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church.

We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of the following; (a) the Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (b) the creed, commonly called the Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith and either it or the Apostles' as the baptismal confession of belief; (c) the divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ; (d) and a ministry acknowledged by every part of the reunited Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the outward commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

With regard to these four essential things, we may remark that (a), (b) and (c) are now received by the overwhelming majority of Christians. It is true that it may be objected that there are certain religious bodies which may feel disposed to repudiate any form of creed. They are not prepared to accept any formal statement of their belief embodied in any of the historical symbols however venerable. They would not care to fetter themselves with any man-made symbol of the faith, and feel that the Holy Scriptures alone are quite sufficient. But is it conceivable that Christian reunion can ever take place without some such brief consensus of belief, especially when the proposed form contains only such facts as are founded on the word of Holy Scripture? We can only hope that in view of the great cause of reunion all the Churches will be willing to make some sacrifice of form so long as they are not asked to sacrifice any article of the faith. No one can reasonably doubt that the content

of the Apostles' Creed, for instance, is in complete harmony with the Holy Scriptures and is expressed almost in the very words of revelation.

As to the ministry, we ask if we may not reasonably claim that the episcopate is the one means of providing such a common ministry as can be recognized by all the Churches. And here we say that it is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministers of those communions which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But at the same time we beg humbly to submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. At the same time, we greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner and should more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian family in the title of father in God. Nay, more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance, in a united Church, we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the Apostolic right of the laying on of hands and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one family we may all kneel at one altar and, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.

In order to secure this common ministry, which is now the one great need before reunion can be realized, we believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. We therefore suggest that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded

that terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission of recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations as having its place in the one family life. Of course it is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministers of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same strong motive and desire for reunion which animate us would lead ministers who have not accepted it to accept a commission through an episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience, rich in spiritual blessings, for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonoring the Holy Spirit of God Whose call led us to our several ministries, and Whose power enabled us to perform them. On the other hand we shall be publicly and formally seeking and obtaining additional recognition of a new call to a wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's strength and grace to fulfill the same.

It is interesting, as someone has said, to notice whom in particular this will concern. It will concern on the one hand the bishops who will presumably be placed in a position of jurisdiction over what are now separated communities. It will concern on the other hand those ministers of Presbyterian, Congregational, and other Churches who desire, and who are selected to become bishops in the united Church. It is essential that nothing should be done which would cause searchings of

heart and misgivings, and there must be on neither side any feeling of inadequacy or insufficiency. Under such circumstances we would hope that all would do everything they could to ensure good-will in the reunited Church. These are the main regulations which are proposed and provided there is, as we hope, a real and earnest desire for reunion, we think that they ought to be capable of being carried out. Unless there is that desire, no regulations will be possible.

Finally, we believe that the spiritual leadership of the catholic Church in days to come, for which the world is manifestly waiting, depends upon the readiness with which each communion is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service to the world. We place this ideal first and foremost before ourselves and our own people. We call upon them to make the effort to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook. To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make this same appeal. We do not ask that any one communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavor to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

ETHELBERT TALBOT.

Bishop's House, South Bethlehem, Pa.

THE BASES OF UNITY

WE are just beginning to see clearly that the questions of coöperative human relationship are really the outstanding concern of our time. Not that we shall ever attain their complete solution, but we must do better than we are doing now if we are not to spend ourselves in contending with one another instead of creating and releasing some united force adequate for the conduct of a society at once so massive and complicated as is the society of our own time. No need to search for illustrations here; they come out to meet us. Our industrial life has problems enough in all reason—the supply of raw material, the conservation of natural resource, motive power, production, distribution, credit and finance, all these are challenging enough, but more challenging still is the question of relationship between the estranged elements in the producing order, and until we shall obtain something better here than is just now in sight, economic conditions will continue to perplex and disappoint us and spread contagion of their disorder into every field of life.

We are being taught in manifold perplexing ways that the Churches cannot do a united or a successful work in the face of an industrial order divided against itself. The whole international situation is another illustration so outstanding as to need only to be named. We have just been taught that when international relationships break down as they have broken down during the last decade, nothing is secure, no interest nor aspect of life unaffected.

We have long seen that the Churches must themselves subdue their own relationships to the essential spirit of Christianity. Our divisions reproach and weaken us and, more profoundly still, they make it hard for us to make our proper and saving and absolutely essential contribution to the recasting of relationships in other fields. We cannot consistently preach unity to a divided world until

we have attained a working measure of unity ourselves, nor proclaim brotherhood until we exemplify it. All these are commonplaces, but, none the less, they are flaming commonplaces, and all this is fundamentally interrelated. We must advance along the whole front or we cannot really advance at all. Failure in one region involves every other. We cannot be sure of our international relationships as long as the world is shot through and through with economic antagonism, nor can we find a way out of our economic antagonism until we have secured a more coöperative world order, nor can we attain a working measure of Church unity in the face of embittered national or industrial relationships, nor, once more, can we transform national relationships until we are sure of a united Christian sentiment as the driving force behind it all.

The discussion of this whole interrelated situation is taking precedence of everything else and there is a place somewhere in such discussion for the consideration of some rare, simple and even homely things which are at once essential to the realization of our hopes, and yet so simple and homely that we may forget them altogether. The whole tendency just now is to push policies too far ahead of supporting sentiments and creative attitudes and tempers. Professor Jack has just been saying something like this in one or two extremely suggestive essays in *The Atlantic*, apropos indeed of the international situation, but as truly applicable to the coöperation of the Churches or the industrial order. We must, he has been telling us, have the international mind before we can really correct and put across international policies, and indeed we must have the inter-church mind and if one may coin an awkward word, the inter-industrial mind before we can put across unified Church or industrial programmes.

The bases of unity, therefore, really lie deeper than the

pact of the League of Nations, or the Appeal to all Christian People from the bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, or the Encyclical on the Re-establishment of Christian Peace by the pope, or any of the programmes or proposals for unity which to-day constitute a literature of their own. While we should not all agree as to what these deeper bases of unity really are, nevertheless, there are a few of them so simple and so fundamental that one may venture to suggest them as really in one way or another conditioning everything we seek.

First of all we must really be persuaded of the need and worth of some kind of unity. Progress in the larger way is always a matter of action and reaction. A position is strongly taken through the force of contributing circumstances long in action until it shapes policies, voices itself in philosophies and writes itself in creeds. Then, for one reason or another, but really because it is not big enough it is sharply challenged. Little by little the opposing position mobilizes its forces, dictates its policies, voices its philosophies, writes its creeds. Then both positions are seen to be inadequate and the next step is to try to reconcile them in something larger than either of them and including the best of both of them upon which, as upon one step of those "altar stairs which slope through darkness up to God" we may climb a little higher. The larger emphasis of our own immediate past has been upon the free play of individual forces, the value of competition and the creative significance of competitive groups. We have been taught to greatly exalt the particular group to which we belong. This is really a projection into larger fields of the gospel of individualism for which, historically, the eighteenth century supplied the book of Genesis, the nineteenth century the book of Acts and the first two decades of the twentieth century the book of Revelation. For it was soon enough discovered that individualism breaks down unless it reinforces itself by

group action. What we have so far done, therefore, is to create the competitive group, large or small, secular or ecclesiastic, and transfer to that the passions and self assertions of individualism. That in turn has meant an excessive exaltation of the group. We have made its banners the symbol of our loyalties, made the group-interest identical with self-interest and we have fought for it as we have believed it to be fighting for us. But always we see beyond the battle lines thus created some massed and hostile force with which, at our best, we have really made a little truce and against which, when the truce is ended, we have gone out to some battle or other because we really believed that only in such ways as that could we save ourselves and our causes. We have not actually wanted unity, we have been afraid we should thereby lose something which we have been greatly taught to treasure. And even now, as under the stress of circumstance a new passion for unity is coming back amongst us, it is still too largely confined either to the lonely and far-visioned, or to those who have of themselves little force and, in spite of Democracy, no very great voice in the conduct of affairs. The more capable and driving are still more interested in individual self-assertion, or class self-assertion, or denominational self-assertion, or national self-assertion than they are in such ways of living and working together as shall really secure unity. We have still a great work of education to do before we should really have secured that longing for unity in whose transmuting fires the will for unity can be cast and tempered.

In the second place there must still be room in our endeavors after unity for the recognition of the importance of difference. What we are likely afraid of is a numbing and colorless uniformity. We are in love, and rightly so, with the rich variety of life. We naturally think our own variety of life is really better than our neighbor's, but, even so, a world all alike does not greatly appeal to us,

save, paradoxically enough, as we rather welcome and seek our kind of likeness. Even among those who profess to believe in equality, there is a practical distrust and a pretty natural avoidance of it. We shall have to find room in our unities for our differences and the first step toward this is the recognition of the value of not our differences from our neighbor but our neighbor's differences from us. Of course, there are differences which ought not to exist. No just man would continue a moment longer than is absolutely necessary in grinding poverty or humiliating deficiency and dependence, or any kind of weakness which may be used for another man's advantage. The room in which this is being written is, through its fire and warmth, a most agreeable contrast to the raw somberness of an overcast November day and the cold of streets and sidewalks covered with the melting snow of our first November storm. But, after all, it is better to have your own firelight eclipsed by a flood of sunshine, than to ask that a city shiver to exalt your own comfort. No, the backgrounds of differences which we want to keep are the higher and more radiant differences in whose wealth and emphasis of other aspects of truth and life there are contributions, without which we should be poor indeed. We shall never have a real unity until we are as solicitous for the safeguarding of what is really great and true in our neighbor's conscience and achievement and outlook upon life as we are solicitous for what is precious to ourselves. All this probably means integration rather than absolute unification, or at least a unity which conserves what is best in best in those with whom we unite. The more strongly centralized Church will need to be greatly jealous for the liberty of those Churches whose liberty is their distinct contribution, as these in turn will need to recognize and seek somehow to continue the discipline of the more compact

communions. It is easier to say that this must be done than to say how it can be done, but we can at least, in our approach to the whole matter, recognize that values dear to others are all our common concern.

The third basis for unity is the willingness to use every instrument to the uttermost, which is capable at all of being touched and transformed by the spirit of unity and to go as far as we can down roads already open to us before we ask for roads and bridges into an entirely unoccupied territory. There is an immense need of what one may call marginal approaches, the getting a little nearer together and then nearer still, in ways which are open to us all. We may need a new machinery, doubtless we do, but we may begin at least by bringing a new spirit to the machinery which we already have and we shall doubtless find then that there are unexpected opportunities for the exercise of that spirit everywhere about us. We do not need to reorganize industry to make it more truly fraternal, or to reorganize the whole existing ecclesiastical order to get a more fruitful coöperation of the Churches, nor to wipe out the boundary lines of nations to secure a larger internationalism.

The fourth basis of unity is a clear recognition of the way in which institutions have really shaped themselves in answer to encompassing facts and forces, though this is perhaps to beg a bitterly disputed question. But as long as we think of any institution as possessing some sanction apart from the sanctity of the forces which have created it and the sanctity of the service which it renders, we shall be giving to institutions an unyielding rigidity and making them the barriers to progress rather than the facile instruments of the human soul.

Perhaps the most hopeful thing in the pronouncement of the late Lambeth Conference was the changed ground upon which the bishops commended the episcopal order to Christendom. Directly they begin to argue for it on

the basis of its utility and offer it not as the indispensable condition of a true Church but as the hallowed symbol of the Church's fellowship, they improve their whole position. Hereafter, as far as the episcopate is concerned, it is an ideal which we may or may not accept, but it is no longer an order which we must accept upon pain of being excommunicated from the true Christian fellowship. So if we recognize our present economic machinery as itself a growth, subject to further change and not the unchanging form into which all economic life must be cast, we are opening a reasonable door for such changes as may in the future be necessary to finally overcome the antagonism of the different industrial orders. In a word a fourth basis of unity is the recognition that institutions are elastic and not inelastic things. They have been created by the human spirit and they are still its instrument and not its masters.

A fifth basis of unity is friendship pressed to the limit. Human contacts are after all the mightiest solvents of human alienations. Our neighbors, once we come really to know them, are strangely like ourselves, wanting what we want, bearing what we bear, struggling against what we struggle against, one with us in their deeper experiences. Differences in tradition, habit, language and the like blind us to these simple, homely truths, but once we directly begin to know other people in friendly ways we discover them anew.

We are in very great need of the extension of neighborliness. It is the lack of this, due to the mass organization of modern industry, which has more than anything else created the alienation of industrial classes. Those perhaps are nearest together in sympathy and outlook amongst whom there is the largest opportunity for neighborliness; those perhaps are the farthest apart in sympathy and outlook amongst whom, for one reason or another, neighborliness is reduced to a minimum. Lloyd George recently said, in discussing with a group of men

the misunderstandings between England and America, that what England and America really needed was a "smoking room" acquaintance. Some of us understand that phrase better than others, but it means the friendly interchange of view which comes from a relaxed informality of kindly human contact. There is everywhere amongst us a wistful reaching out for neighborliness. There is no group, nor class, nor institution which is not extending, as it were, filaments of desire going out to meet and intertwine with other filaments of like desire. The world has need as never before of neighborly visitation. Travel, interchange of points of view in representative groups, the creation of groups whose object shall be better mutual understanding, a literature of friendship to which this magazine belongs, and although such things are so easily within our power and so absolutely necessary that we ought for the time to be more greatly concerned about creating them than about securing the results which they should be created to secure. Once we get the contacts and the results will follow.

Another basis of unity akin to this is the recognition of our identities. Indeed this has already been so touched upon as not to need enlargement were it not for the fact that the want of this, perhaps more than anything else, is holding us apart. We need to think of people not in terms of their classification but in terms of their humanity. English folk are folk first and English afterwards, and so are Americans, and Italians and Russians and Germans. Roman Catholics and Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists are Christians first and members of their communions afterwards. We are not in any position, through our strength, to despise our neighbor for his weakness, nor are we in any position, through our weakness, to do without our neighbor's help. For all this brings us face to face with still another basis of unity and that is the recognition of our interdependence. Labor cannot do without leadership, nor leadership without

help. Every Church is strongest when other Churches are strongest. No member can die without its corruption affecting the entire body, nor can any member suffer without the pain of it shooting through every nerve. We have been strangely slow in recognizing this even in our Church relationships, and stupidly slow in recognizing it in our industrial relationships, and tragically slow in recognizing it in our international relationships. If America thinks herself able to go on unimpoverished in the poverty of the world and unwounded in the wounds of the world, America will be taught presently how mistaken she really is. Our problems after all are common problems. No one of us unaided is equal to the weight of so massive and complicated a world as ours. Once we come to see this and, more really still, come to feel it deeply then we shall be more than willing to sit at common council tables. We shall be more anxious for the organizations and forces through which, in the surrender of our independence for the sake of our interdependence, we shall win back a nobler independence still. For what we really need is not to be independent of one another but to be more truly independent of what stifles the soul and belittles life and we cannot win such a dependence as this alone.

The bases of unity then are in juster tempers and keener insights, better understandings, more fraternal attitudes and more sincere longings for all such things as these. And all this calls for education and thought, and above all, a more generous hospitality to what is essential and transforming in the spirit of Jesus Christ. Tempers and attitudes must underlie politics and policies and a transformed soul must underlie tempers and attitudes and there is no force great enough to achieve all this save essential Christianity given an open right of way and beginning with ourselves.

GAIUS GLENN ATKINS.

First Congregational Church,
Detroit, Mich.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND ITS EX- TERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

ADOPTED BY THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH
IN AMERICA AT WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 26, 1920.

WHEREAS, during the past two years the Executive Board has been asked repeatedly to define the attitude of the United Lutheran Church in America toward coöperative movements, both within and without the Lutheran Church, toward movements of various kinds looking in the direction of Church union, and toward organizations, tendencies and movements, some of them within and some of them without the organized Church: and

WHEREAS, the constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America (Art. VIII, Sec. 1) and its by-laws (Sec. 5, Div. C, Items 1 and 2) require that the forming and dissolving of "relations with other bodies, organizations and movements" lies within the power of the United Lutheran Church alone and that "all questions affecting the principles, practice and policy of the Church as a whole" shall be referred to the Church for decision: therefore,

The Executive Board submits to the United Lutheran Church the following DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS, and recommends it for adoption.

In order that all misunderstandings and misconstructions of this Declaration, or of any of its parts, may be avoided, the United Lutheran Church in America declares in advance that it does not regard the statements therein contained as altering or amending the Confessions of the Church in any particular, or as changing the doctrinal basis of the United Lutheran Church, set forth in Article II of the constitution. On the contrary, it considers this Declaration nothing more than the ap-

plication to present conditions of doctrines already contained in the Confessions.

A. CONCERNING THE CATHOLIC SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

I. In its Confessions the Evangelical Lutheran Church declares its belief that there is “one holy Church,” which “will continue forever.” It defines this Church as the “congregation of saints and true believers.” (Augs. Conf., VII and VIII.)

II. This one holy Church performs its earthly functions and makes its presence known among men through groups of men, who profess to be believers in Jesus Christ. In these groups the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered. To such groups also the name “Church” is given in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our Church.

III. The existence of the one, holy Church is not capable of demonstration. It is a “mystery” that can be apprehended only by faith. To the eyes of men it appears that there is not one Church, but only many Churches; nevertheless, we believe that there is but one Church of Jesus Christ. This conviction rests upon our belief in the continued life of Christ in all His Christians, binding them together into one spiritual body, of which He is the Head, and building them up into one spiritual Temple, of which He is the Corner-stone; and upon our belief in the efficacy of the Word of God and the Sacraments as means of grace (A. C., V). We believe that wherever the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are administered, the Holy Spirit works faith in Christ. In every such place, therefore, there are believers in Jesus Christ, and wherever there are believers, there the one holy Church is present. For this reason we call the Word and the Sacraments “marks” or “signs” of the one holy Church. Therefore the Augsburg Confession adds to its definition of the Church the

words, "in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered."

IV. In the Nicene Creed we confess our belief that this Church is "one, holy, catholic and apostolic."

1. We believe that this Church is one, because we believe that there cannot be more than one "congregation of saints and true believers," or more than one spiritual Body of which Christ is the Head, or more than one spiritual Temple of which He is the Corner-stone.

2. We believe that this Church is holy, because we believe that to all believers the righteousness of Christ is given, with the forgiveness of their sins, for which reason true believers are called "saints" in the New Testament and in the Confessions of our Church. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments preached and administered in the Churches, does progressively create holiness of life and will and purpose in all those who believe, and progressively unites their lives with the continued life of Christ.

3. We believe that this one holy Church is catholic, because we believe that, since there is but one "congregation of saints and true believers," it must include all the saints and true believers, of every time and place (Apol., Chap. IV). By the term "catholic," therefore, we describe that quality of universality which belongs to the Church as a spiritual reality, or object of faith (Cf. III, above), and raises it above all local and temporal forms of expression in organization, rite and ceremony.

4. We believe that this one, holy, catholic Church is also apostolic, not because of the union of its members in any one organization which claims to possess external, historical connection with the apostles, but because we believe that the faith in Jesus Christ, which all the members of the one, holy catholic Church have in common, is the same faith that was in the hearts and lives of the apostles of Jesus Christ; and because we believe that

this faith has been and still is perpetuated by the unbroken testimony of believers, through all the centuries of Christian history, from the days of the apostles to the present day; and because we believe that in the Holy Scriptures we have a permanent and authoritative record of that apostolic truth which is the ground of Christian faith.

V. Every group of professing Christians calling itself a Church will seek to express in its own life the attributes of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. This it does:

1. By professing faith in Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ, as the Saviour of the world and the Revealer of the will and love of God the Father, is necessary to the existence of the Church. Therefore, no group of men, however, organized, which does not exist as a congregation of professed believers in Jesus Christ, may claim the name of Church; for it is Christ Himself, living, by the Holy Spirit, in believing Christians, Who makes the Church one and holy.

2. By preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. Every group calling itself a Church must preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, for these are the means through which the Holy Spirit works faith, and thus creates and perpetuates the one holy Church. Therefore, the Word and the Sacraments are properly called "marks" of the Church (Cf. III, above), for where they are present the Church is; where they are absent the Church is not and cannot be.

In the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments every group of Christians seeks to express the apostolic character of the one holy Church. Every such group bases its preaching and teaching upon the Scriptures, and endeavors to proclaim what it has learned from them. Believing that it has correctly ascertained this truth, it becomes its duty to teach, preach and

confess it fully, freely and courageously. Christians must not only profess their faith in Christ, but must also confess and publicly declare what they believe about Christ and His Gospel; this duty of every Christian is the imperative duty of every group of Christians calling itself a Church.

3. By works of serving love. The ideals of love and service which Christ has taught as the true ideals of the individual Christian life, must also be the ideals of any group calling itself a Church. The love of Christians for God and His Christ, for one another and their fellow-men, is a motive strong enough to drive them to works of service, and this love, itself a creation of God the Holy Spirit within the hearts of men, sets tasks for every group that calls itself a Church. They are tasks of service, not of government; of love, not of law (Cf. D, IV, 3, below). These works of love and service are a witness to the faith that lives in the whole group and an evidence of the presence of the living Christ, and are in themselves a proclamation of the Gospel. In outward form they may appear to be merely humanitarian and altruistic; in motive they are Christian, born of the love of Christ, and performed in His name and in obedience to His command.

4. By the attempt to secure universal acceptance of the truth which it holds and confesses. Such an attempt need not be accompanied by the effort to enlarge its own external organization by drawing into its membership Christians of other organizations, for the aim of a Church should be not to make proselytes, but to spread the truth of the Gospel. To this end it will constantly bear witness to the truth which it believes, and by this testimony, and by the cultivation of sympathy with all those who hold the same truth, every group will seek to attain universality, and thus express completely the holy Church's attribute of catholicity.

5. To accomplish these purposes (Nos. 1-4 above) every such group will maintain the office of the ministry, commanded and instituted by Christ. For the sake of good order and efficiency, further organization is also necessary, but the forms which the organization takes will vary with circumstances of time and place, and are, in themselves, matters of expediency.

VI. Every group of professing Christians in which the Word of God is so preached and the Sacraments are so administered that men are saved therein is truly, partial and imperfect, as it may be, an expression of the one holy Church (Cf. II, above), inasmuch as it displays the marks of the Church (Cf. III and V, 2, above). Therefore, no one group can rightfully claim that it is the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church in the sense in which these terms have been defined above (No. IV).

We believe, however, that distinctions must be recognized between one group and another. In making these distinctions, we believe that those groups in which the Word of God is most purely preached and confessed, according to the Holy Scriptures, and in which the Sacraments are administered in the closest conformity to the institution of Christ, will be the most complete expression of the one, holy Church. For this reason it is necessary that, when occasion arises, any such group of Christians shall define its relationship to other groups which also claim the name of Church, as well as to other groups and organizations which do not bear that name.

VII. This definition of relationships should be framed in the spirit of catholicity. Moved by that spirit, a Church will always be ready:

1. To declare unequivocally what it believes concerning Christ and His Gospel, and to endeavor to show that it has placed the true interpretation upon that Gospel (Cf. V, 2 and 4, above), and to testify definitely and frankly against error.

2. To approach others without hostility, jealousy, suspicion or pride, in the sincere and humble desire to give and receive Christian service.

3. To grant cordial recognition to all agreements which are discovered between its own interpretation of the Gospel and that which others hold.

4. To coöperate with other Christians in works of serving love (Cf. V, 3, above) in so far as this can be done without surrender of its interpretation of the Gospel, without denial of conviction, and without suppression of its testimony as to what it holds to be the truth.

B. CONCERNING THE RELATION OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH BODIES TO ONE ANOTHER

In the case of those Church bodies calling themselves Evangelical Lutheran, and subscribing the Confessions which have always been regarded as the standards of Evangelical Lutheran doctrine, the United Lutheran Church in America recognizes no doctrinal reasons against complete coöperation and organic union with such bodies.

C. CONCERNING THE ORGANIC UNION OF PROTESTANT CHURCHES

In view of the widespread discussion concerning the organic union of the Protestant Churches in America, we declare:

I. That we hold the union of Christians in a single organization to be of less importance than the agreement of Christians in the proclamation of the Gospel. We believe that the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church exists through and under divergent forms of external organization. Union of organization we hold, therefore, to be a matter of expediency; agreement in testimony to be a matter of principle.

II. That holding the preaching of the Gospel and the

administration of the Sacraments to be the primary function of every Church, we believe that a clear definition of what is meant by "Gospel" and "Sacrament" must precede any organic union of the Churches. We believe that a permanent and valid union of Churches must be based upon positive agreements concerning the truth for which the united Church body is to stand. The Churches cannot unite as mere protestants, but only as confessors. (Cf. A, V, 2; VII, 4.)

III. That as a necessary step toward a genuine organic union, we believe that the Protestant Church bodies in America should endeavor to set forth, definitely and positively, the views of Christian truth for which each of them does now actually stand, in order that by their clear and unequivocal testimony to what they hold to be the truth, the nature and extent of their agreements and disagreements may become apparent.

IV. That we recognize the obligation which rests upon us to make a clear and full declaration concerning the truth which we hold, and are therefore ready, as opportunity offers, to give answer concerning our reasons for accepting and maintaining the doctrines and principles set forth in the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

V. That until a more complete unity of confession is attained than now exists, the United Lutheran Church in America is bound in duty and in conscience to maintain its separate identity as a witness to the truth which it knows; and its members, its ministers, its pulpits, its fonts and its altars must testify only to that truth.

D. CONCERNING COÖPERATIVE MOVEMENTS AMONG THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES

In view of the many proposals for coöperation of the Protestant Churches in various departments of practical activity, and in view of the many organizations already

formed, and in process of formation, for the carrying on of such coöperative work, we declare:

I. That it is our earnest desire to coöperate with other Church bodies in all such works as can be regarded as works of serving love, through which the faith of Christians finds expression; provided, that such coöperation does not involve the surrender of our interpretation of the Gospel, the denial of conviction, or the suppression of our testimony to what we hold to be the truth. (Cf. A, V, 4; VII, 3, above.) In this connection, however, we call attention to the constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America, Article VIII, Section 1, "No synod, conference or board, or any official representative thereof, shall have the power of independent affiliation with general organizations and movements," and also to the by-laws, Article V, Division C, Item 2, "No official relationship with any other ecclesiastical bodies or their agencies shall be entered into by any board or committee of the United Lutheran Church in America, without the approval of the Church."

II. That we cannot give general approval to all co-operative movements and organizations of the Churches, since we hold that coöperation is not an end in itself, but merely a means to an end. Our attitude toward any such organization or movement must be determined by a consideration of

(a) The purposes which it seeks to accomplish.

(b) The principles on which it rests.

(c) The effect which our participation will produce upon the independent position of our Church as a witness to the truth of the Gospel which we confess. (Cf. C, VII, above.)

III. That, holding the following doctrines and principles, derived from the Holy Scriptures, to be fundamental to the Christian message, we propose them as a positive basis of practical coöperation among the Prot-

estant Churches. To avoid all possible misunderstandings or misconstructions of these statements, we declare that we do not regard them as a summary of Lutheran doctrine, or as an addition to, a substitute for, or a modification of the Confessions of our Church; nor do we propose them as an adequate basis for an organic union of the Churches, but merely as a criterion by which it may be possible for us to determine our attitude toward proposed movements of coöperation.

1. The Fatherhood of God, revealed in His Son Jesus Christ, and the sonship bestowed by God, through Christ, upon all who believe in Him.

2. The true Godhead of Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His life and death and resurrection; and His living presence in His Church.

3. The continued activity of God the Holy Spirit among men, calling them into the fellowship of Jesus Christ, and enlightening and sanctifying them through the gifts of His grace.

4. The supreme importance of the Word of God and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the means through which the Holy Spirit testifies of Christ and thus creates and strengthens faith. (In common with the whole Evangelical Lutheran Church, we confess the mystery of the real presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we invite all Christians to a renewed study of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures concerning this Sacrament, and the Sacrament of holy Baptism.)

5. The authority of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only rule and standard by which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

6. The reality and universality of sin, and the inability of men, because of sin, to attain righteousness or earn salvation through their own character or works.

7. The love, and the righteousness, of God, Who for Christ's sake bestows forgiveness and righteousness upon all who believe in Christ.

8. The present existence upon earth of the kingdom of God, founded by His Son Jesus Christ, not as an external organization, but as a spiritual reality and an object of faith.

9. The hope of Christ's second coming, to be the Judge of the living and the dead, and to complete the kingdom of God.

IV. That, in view of the above statements, our attitude toward proposed coöperative movements and organizations, already defined in principle in Section A, VII and D, I, above, must be subject to the following limitations:

1. We cannot enter into any coöperative movement or organization which denies any of the doctrines or principles set forth in III, above.

2. We cannot enter into any organization or movement which limits the coöperating Churches in their confession of the truth or their testimony against error. In all coöperative movements we claim the right, and regard it as a duty, to testify freely to the truth as it is set forth in the Confessions of our Church, and we believe that the same right must be guaranteed to every participating Church. All such testimony should receive a courteous and respectful hearing.

3. We cannot enter into coöperative movements or organizations whose purposes lie outside the proper sphere of Church activity. In determining what that sphere is, we must be guided by the fundamental principle that the functions of the Church are the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the performances of works of love (Cf. A, V, above). We hold that the use of the Church organization as an agency for securing the enactment and enforcement of

law, or for the application of other methods of external force, is foreign to the true purpose for which the Church exists.

V. That there are organizations and movements into which we cannot enter as a Church, in regard to which, however, the Church may definitely declare itself and which it may heartily commend to the pastors and members of its congregations as important spheres of activity for Christians, such as movements and organizations for social and political reform, the enforcement of law and order, the settlement of industrial conflicts, the improvement of the material environments of life, and the like.

E. CONCERNING MOVEMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS INJURIOUS TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

In view of the prevalence throughout our land of doctrines which are subversive of the Christian faith; and in view of the indifference manifested by many Christian people to the doctrines and principles of the teachers, sects and organizations which seek their adherence and support; and in view of the fact that through the acceptance of religious and other teachings which contradict the Gospel of Christ, the faith of Christians is endangered; we declare

I. That we solemnly warn all our pastors and the members of our congregations against all teachers, sects and organizations of any kind, whose doctrines and principles contradict the truths set forth in Section D, III, of this Declaration, or which limit their adherents or members in a free confession of their Christian faith. (Cf. A, V, 3, above.)

II. That we warn them especially against all teachers, sects and societies whose doctrines and principles deny the reality of sin, the personality of God, the full and complete Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His redemption of the world by His sufferings and death, and

the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures; as well as against all teachers, sects and societies which teach that men can be saved from sin, or can become righteous before God, by their own works or by any other means than the grace and mercy of God in Jesus Christ. We believe that such doctrines are not only not Christian, but are anti-Christian and destructive of true Christian faith and life.

III. That inasmuch as these and other false and dangerous doctrines are widely spread, not only by the activity of individual teachers, but also by the dissemination of literature and through the agency of societies and other organizations, calling themselves by various names which oftentimes conceal the real nature of the doctrines and principles for which they stand; we therefore lay it upon the consciences of the pastors and of the members of all our congregations to scrutinize with the utmost care the doctrines and principles of all teachers, sects, organizations and societies of every sort which seek their adherence and support, and to refuse such adherence and support in all cases of conflict or possible contradiction between these principles and doctrines and those set forth in Holy Scripture and in the Confessions of the Church. In the application of this principle the Church should always appeal to a conscience which it is her sacred duty to enlighten, patiently and persistently, from the Word of God. (Cf., also constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America, Art. VIII, Sec. 6.)

THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIAN PEACE

BENEDICT XV, BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND
ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH
THE HOLY SEE

VENERABLE BRETHREN,

HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION

PEACE, the beautiful gift of God, the name of which, as St. Augustine says, is the sweetest word to our hearing and the best and most desirable possession¹; peace, which was for more than four years implored by the ardent wishes of all good peoples, by the prayers of pious souls and the tears of mothers, begins at last to shine upon the nations. At this we are indeed the happiest of all, and heartily do we rejoice. But this joy of our paternal heart is disturbed by many bitter anxieties, for if in most places peace is in some sort established and treaties signed, the germs of former enmities remain; and you well know, venerable brethren, that there can be no stable peace or lasting treaties, though made after long and difficult negotiations and duly signed, unless there be return of mutual charity to appease hate and banish enmity. This, then, venerable brethren, is the anxious and dangerous question upon which we wish to dwell and to put forward recommendations to be brought home to your people.

For ourselves, never since, by the hidden designs of God, we were raised to this chair have we ceased to do everything in our power from the very beginning of the war that all the nations of the world might resume cordial relations as soon as possible. To that end we never ceased to pray, to repeat exhortations, to propose ways

(1) *Civitate Dei*. I XIX, C. II.

of arrangement, to try every means, in fact, to open by divine aid, a path to a just, honourable and lasting peace; and at the same time we exercised all our paternal care to alleviate everywhere the terrible load of sorrow and disaster of every sort by which the immense tragedy was accompanied.

And now, just as from the beginning of our troubled pontificate the charity of Jesus Christ led us to work both for the return of peace and to alleviate the horrors of the war, so now that comparative peace has been concluded, this same charity urges us to exhort all the children of the Church, and all mankind, to clear their hearts of bitterness, and to give place to mutual love and concord.

FORGIVENESS AND RECONCILIATION

There is no need from us of long proof to show that society would incur the risk of great loss if, while peace is signed, latent hostility and enmity were to continue among the nations. There is no need to mention the loss of all that maintains and fosters civil life, such as commerce and industry, art and literature, which flourish only when the nations are at peace. But what is even more important, grave harm would accrue to the form and essence of the Christian life, which consists essentially in charity and the preaching of which is called the Gospel of peace².

You know well, and we have frequently reminded you of it, nothing was so often and so carefully inculcated on His disciples by Jesus Christ as this precept of mutual charity as the one which contains all others. Christ called it the new commandment, His very own, and desired that it should be the sign of Christians by which they might be distinguished from all others; and on the eve of His death it was His last testament to His disciples to love one another and thus try to imitate the in-

(2) Eph. VI. 15.

effable unity of the three divine Persons in the Trinity. "That they may be one as we also are one . . . that they may be made perfect in one"³.

The apostles, following in the steps of the divine Master, and conforming to His word and commands, were unceasing in their exhortation to the faithful: "Before all things have a constant mutual charity among yourselves"⁴. "But above all these things have charity which is the bond of perfection"⁵. "Dearly beloved, let us love one another for charity is God"⁶. Our brethren of the first Christian ages faithfully observed these commands of Jesus Christ and the apostles. They belonged to different and rival nations; yet they willingly forgot their causes of quarrel and lived in perfect concord, and such a union of hearts was in striking contrast with the deadly enmities by which human society was then consumed.

What has already been said in favour of charity holds good for the inculcation of the pardoning of injuries which is no less solemnly commanded by the Lord: "But I say to you, love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; pray for those that persecute you and calumniate you that you may be the children of your Father who is in Heaven, Who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and the bad."⁷. Hence that terribly severe warning of the Apostle St. John. "Whoever hateth his brother is a murderer. And you know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in himself"⁸.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, in teaching us how to pray to God, makes us say that we wish for pardon as we forgive others: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us"⁹. And if the observance of this law is sometimes hard and difficult, we have not only

(3) John VII. 21-23.

(4) Peter IV. 8.

(5) Col. III. 14.

(6) I John IV. 7.

(7) Matt. V. 44, 45.

(8) I John III. 15.

(9) Matt. VI. 12.

the timely assistance of the grace of our divine Redeemer but also His example to help us to overcome the difficulty. For as He hung on the Cross He thus excused before His Father those who so unjustly and wickedly tortured him: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"¹⁰. We then, who should be the first to imitate the pity and lovingkindness of Jesus Christ, whose Vicar, without any merit of our own, we are; with all our heart, and following His example, we forgive all our enemies who knowingly or unknowingly have heaped and are still heaping on our person and our work every sort of vituperation, and we embrace all in our charity and benevolence and neglect no opportunity to do them all the good in our power. That is indeed what Christians worthy of the name ought to do toward those who during the war have done them wrong.

Christian charity ought not to be content with not hating our enemies and loving them as brothers; it also demands that we treat them with kindness, following the rule of the divine Master Who "went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil"¹¹, and finished His mortal life, the course of which was marked by good deeds, by shedding His blood for them. So said St. John: "In this we have known the charity of God, because He hath laid down His life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. He that hath substance of this world and shall see his brother in need and shall shut up his bowels from him: how doth the charity of God abide in him? My little children, let us love not in word nor by tongue, but in deed and in truth"¹².

Never indeed was there a time when we should "stretch the bounds of charity" more than in these days of universal suffering and sorrow; never perhaps as to-day has

(10) Luke XXIII. 34.

(11) Acts X. 38.

(12) I John iii. 16-18.

humanity so needed that universal beneficence which springs from the love of others, and is full of sacrifice and zeal. For if we look around where the fury of the war has been let loose we see immense regions utterly desolate, uncultivated and abandoned; multitudes reduced to want of food, clothing and shelter; innumerable widows and orphans reft of everything, and an incredible number of enfeebled beings, particularly children and young people, who carry on their bodies the ravages of this atrocious war.

When one regards all these miseries by which the human race is stricken one inevitably thinks of the traveller in the Gospel¹³ who, going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among thieves, who robbed him, and covered him with wounds and left him half dead. The two cases are very similar; and as to the traveller there came the good Samaritan, full of compassion, who bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, took him to an inn, and undertook all care for him, so too is it necessary that Jesus, of Whom the Samaritan was the figure, should lay His hands upon the wounds of society.

This work, this duty the Church claims as her own as heir and guardian of the spirit of Jesus Christ—the Church whose entire existence is a marvellously varied tissue of all kinds of good deeds, the Church, “that real mother of Christians in the full sense of the word, who has such tenderness of love and charity for one’s neighbours that she can offer the best remedies for the different evils which afflict souls on account of their sins.” That is why she “treats and teaches children with tenderness, young people with firmness, old people with great calm, taking account not only of the age but also the condition of soul of each”¹⁴. It would be difficult to exaggerate the effect of this many-sided Christian

(13) Luke X. 30 et seq.

(14) Augustin *de Moribus Ecc. Cat.* lib I. C. 30.

beneficence in softening the heart and thus facilitating the return of tranquillity to the nations.

Therefore, venerable brethren, we pray you and exhort you in the mercy and charity of Jesus Christ, strive with all zeal and diligence not only to urge the faithful entrusted to your care to abandon hatred and to pardon offences; but, and what is more immediately practical, to promote all those works of Christian benevolence which bring aid to the needy, comfort to the afflicted and protection to the weak, and to give opportune and appropriate assistance of every kind to all who have suffered from the war. It is our special wish that you should exhort your priests, as the ministers of peace, to be assiduous in urging this love of one's neighbour and even of enemies which is the essence of the Christian life, and by "being all things to all men"¹⁵ and giving an example to others, wage war everywhere on enmity and hatred, thus doing a thing most agreeable to the loving heart of Jesus and to him who, however unworthily, holds His place on earth. In this connection Catholic writers and journalists should be invited to clothe themselves "as elect of God, holy and beloved, with pity and kindness"¹⁶. Let them show this charity in their writings by abstaining not only from false and groundless accusations, but also from all intemperance and bitterness of language, all of which is contrary to the law of Christ and does but reopen sores as yet unhealed, seeing that the slightest touch is a serious irritant to a heart whose wounds are recent.

All that we have said here to individuals about the duty of charity we wish to say also to the peoples who have been delivered from the burden of a long war, in order that, when every cause of disagreement has been, as far as possible, removed, and without prejudice to the rights of justice, they may resume friendly relations

(15) I Cor. ix. 22.

(16) Col. iii. 12.

among themselves. The Gospel has not one law of charity for individuals and another for states and nations, which are indeed but collections of individuals. The war being now over, people seem called to a general reconciliation not only from motives of charity, but from necessity; the nations are naturally drawn together by the need they have of one another, and by the bond of mutual goodwill, bonds which are to-day strengthened by the development of civilization and the marvelous increase of communication.

Truly, as we have already said, this apostolic see has never wearied of teaching during the war such pardon of offences and the fraternal reconciliation of the peoples, in conformity with the most holy law of Jesus Christ, and in agreement with the needs of civil life and human intercourse; nor did it allow that amid dissension and hate these moral principles should be forgotten. With all the more reason then, now that the treaties of peace are signed, does it proclaim these principles as, for example, it did a short time ago in the letter to the bishops of Germany¹⁷, and in that addressed to the archbishop of Paris¹⁸.

And this concord between civilized nations is maintained and fostered by the modern custom of visits and meetings at which the heads of states and princes are accustomed to treat of matters of special importance. So then, considering the changed circumstances of the times and the dangerous trend of events, and in order to encourage this concord, we would not be unwilling to relax in some measure the severity of the conditions justly laid down by our predecessors, when the civil power of the apostolic see was overthrown, against the official visits of the heads of Catholic states to Rome. But at the same time we formally declare that this concession, which seems counselled or rather demanded by the grave circumstances in which to-day society is placed,

(17) *Litterae Apost. Diuturni*, xv Jul., MCMXIX.

(18) *Epist. Amor Ille Singularis*, vii Oct., MCMXIX.

must not be interpreted as a tacit renunciation of its sacrosanct rights by the apostolic see, as if it acquiesced in the unlawful situation in which it is placed. Rather do we seize this opportunity to renew for the same reasons the protests which our predecessors have several times made, not in the least moved thereto by human interests, but in fulfilment of the sacred duty of their charge to defend the rights and dignity of this apostolic see; once again demanding, and with even greater insistence now that peace is made among the nations, that "for the head of the Church, too, an end may be put to that abnormal condition which in so many ways does such serious harm to tranquillity among the peoples"¹⁹.

Things being thus restored, the order required by justice and charity re-established and the nations reconciled, it is much to be desired, venerable brethren, that all states, putting aside mutual suspicion, should unite in one league, or rather a sort of family of peoples, calculated both to maintain their own independence and safeguard the order of human society. What specially, amongst other reasons, calls for such an association of nations, is the need generally recognized of making every effort to abolish or reduce the enormous burden of the military expenditure which states can no longer bear, in order to prevent these disastrous wars or at least to remove the danger of them as far as possible. So would each nation be assured not only of its independence but also of the integrity of its territory within its just frontiers.

The Church will certainly not refuse her zealous aid to states united under the Christian law in any of their undertakings inspired by justice and charity, inasmuch as she is herself the most perfect type of universal society. She possesses in her organization and institutions a wonderful instrument for bringing this brotherhood among men, not only for their eternal salvation but also

(19) Litt. Enc. *Ad Beatissimi*, i Nov. MCMXIV.

for their material well-being in this world; she leads them through temporal well-being to the sure acquisition of eternal blessings. It is the teaching of history that when the Church pervaded with her spirit the ancient and barbarous nations of Europe, little by little the many and varied differences that divided them were diminished and their quarrels extinguished; in time they formed a homogeneous society from which sprang Christian Europe which, under the guidance and auspices of the Church, whilst preserving a diversity of nations, tended to a unity that favoured its prosperity and glory. On this point St. Augustine well says: "This celestial city, in its life here on earth, calls to itself citizens of every nation, and forms out of all the peoples one varied society; it is not harassed by differences in customs, laws and institutions, which serve to the attainment or the maintenance of peace on earth; it neither rends nor destroys anything but rather guards all and adapts itself to all; however these things may vary among the nations, they are all directed to the same end of peace on earth as long as they do not hinder the exercise of religion, which teaches the worship of the true, supreme God"²⁰. And the same holy doctor thus addresses the Church: "Citizens, peoples and all men, thou, recalling their common origin, shalt not only unite among themselves, but shalt make them brothers"²¹.

To come back to what we said at the beginning, we turn affectionately to all our children and conjure them in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to forget mutual differences and offences and draw together in the bonds of Christian charity, from which none are excluded and within which none are strangers. We fervently exhort all the nations, under the inspiration of Christian benevolence, to establish a true peace among themselves and join together in an alliance which shall be just and therefore lasting. And lastly we appeal to all men and all

(20) *De Civitate Dei*, lib xix, cap. 17.

(21) *De Moribus Ecc. Cat.* i, cap 30.

peoples to join in mind and heart with the Catholic Church and through the Church with Christ the Redeemer of the human race, so that we may address to them in very truth the words of St. Paul to the Ephesians: "But now in Christ Jesus you who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace, Who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition . . . killing the enmities in himself. And coming He preached peace to you that were far off and peace to them that were nigh"²².

Nor less appropriate are the words which the same apostle addressed to the Colossians: "Lie not to one another: stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds. And putting on the new, him who is renewed unto knowledge according to the image of Him that created it. Where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all"²³.

Meanwhile, trusting in the protection of Mary the virgin immaculate, who not long ago we directed should be universally invoked as "Queen of Peace," as also in the intercession of the three blessed to whom we have decreed the honour of saints, we humbly implore the Holy Ghost the Paraclete that He may "graciously grant to the Church the gifts of unity and peace"²⁴, and may renew the face of the earth by a fresh outpouring of His charity for the salvation of all. As an earnest of these heavenly gifts and as a pledge of our paternal benevolence, we impart with all our heart to you, venerable brethren, to all your clergy and people, the apostolic benediction.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the Feast of Pentecost, 1920, and in the sixth year of our pontificate.

BENEDICT XV, *Pope*.

(22) Eph. ii, 13 et seq.

(23) Col. iii, 9-11.

(24) Secreta in Solemn. Corpus Christi.

AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE WORLD'S WAITING AND OUR TARRYING

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:—Without attempting to answer directly some of the critics of my letter in the October number of THE QUARTERLY, I move to say that this is no time to be apologizing for divisions in the Church. There is no reason why Churches of the same family group should not get together in the next few years, unless denominational pride and sectarian selfishness continue to dominate the various denominations. Neither is there any reason why some of the larger communions of different groups could not enter into coöperative agreements now. Competing Churches are unchristian irrespective of what their orthodoxy may be. I am not interested in their prayers nor their sermons nor their creedal statements, but to their prayers, sermons and creeds is given contradiction by their competing in a given territory for the leading place. The whole programme is opposed to the religion of Jesus and recalls what Jesus said in the days of His flesh: “Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him two-fold more a son of hell than yourselves.” It is this kind of policy that has been the weakening factor of the Church and for pious people to hide behind it simply because it exists and say it is the will of the Lord because we are witnessing for some half truth may be classed under those hypocritical pretensions of the Jewish sects which Jesus so severely indicted.

Recently there was held in St. Louis, Missouri, a convention of dealers in paints, varnishes, etc. Those six hundred men spent a week in giving themselves to finding the basis of coöperation and in their years of work they have so far exceeded the Church in coöperation that one is simply amazed when he reads the minutes of a group

of men selling paints and varnishes to find how much wiser they have been in putting out their products than the Church has been in putting out its products. This mercantile organization has successfully abandoned competition and established coöperation, while the Churches which are putting out the only article for the world's redemption, are maintaining a policy of competition that ultimately means death. One of the conundrums which some of us are trying to solve is why the Church should be at the tail end of things in coöperation instead of setting the example of the evils of competition to dealers in paints and varnishes.

I read with interest in your last issue the Appeal of the Anglican bishops and I think its spirit is beautiful and its approach reverential. They are beginning at the right place when they insist upon a generally recognized ministry. Every preacher of the gospel or prophet or priest of God ought to have the freedom to minister at all altars and preach from all pulpits. That must come and I hail with joy any move that contributes to that ideal.

Facing the condition as we have it now it is most discouraging with several kinds of baptisms and several kinds of confirmations and several kinds of creeds and several kinds of denominational names, all making a medley of the sublimest task that has ever been committed to men. If the Episcopal bishop is willing to be ordained to the privileges of your communion, why is it that you are not willing to be ordained to the privileges of his communion? Would he receive you for ordination if you look upon his orders as he now looks upon yours? If you accept ordination at his hands would you be bound to the doctrines of his Church as he would be if he accepted ordination at your hands? Does ordination carry with it the sectarian implication of loyalty to the denomination that ordains you? Is it not necessary to find a universal

principle in ordination so that one may be ordained by those of another communion, without separating him from his own communion, but instead deepen his relationship with Christ and his brethren?

There are religious bodies who feel they must guard one's confession of Christ and one's Baptism into Christ and one's confirmation, tying them up with their denomination. I am raising the question with you whether this position can be maintained. Really is it not true that confession and Baptism and confirmation are universal practices and as such one entering into these cannot be rightly tied up to any denomination?

The world is interested in religion, not in the things about which we differ. A man proves his religion not because he says the Nicene Creed or is confirmed by the bishop or partakes of the Sacrament every Sunday, but he proves his religion by his conduct, which is the expression of a living faith. I should like to know why you do not call to task some of these deceptions to the truth. I am not talking about heresies as related to theology, but heresies as related to the common conduct of Christianity. Jesus taught us that the only way that we could know that a man is a follower of His, is by his conduct. Is it not possible for us to get back to New Testament principles? I have often wondered why there is no religious body on the face of the earth that is courageous enough to take the New Testament and live by it as Jesus taught us to do, covering the whole field of our relation to God and our fellows, making the interpretation of love the prime characteristic of individual experience. It would be a difficult standard to set up in the world these days and it would doubtless be costly to those who undertook to do it, but the Church some day has to come to that standard or else deteriorate.

Your account of the Switzerland conferences is interesting and getting together has great power, but I am

wondering why a thousand conferences cannot be held all over the world just such as those held in Switzerland. Is it that the ministry to whom we must look for guidance has not developed the conscience upon this grave subject? If the conscience has not been developed out of the catastrophe of the World War, what greater voice could one desire to call all Churches into coöperation and sacrifice? Each denomination appears now to be putting forth its best efforts to entrench itself against the approaches of unity. They have raised great sums of money for their respective denominational interests. It is so belittling and unworthy that one wonders why it should have place in the thinking of the great and reverent minds of this day. Far more important is the getting together in actual coöperation and union. Many of these bodies are working in the same community competing with each other and still living and are thereby proving that there is power in the religion of Jesus.

If I am pushing you too hard for answers to these questions I should be glad for some of the readers of THE QUARTERLY to venture to answer. We have got to be frank. We have got to see where we are. We have got to know that grave responsibilities are upon us, and we have got to go to our task in the fear of God. The past can take care of itself, for it is already fixed, but the future is to be made and our pattern for it ought not to be gotten out of the past, but instead out of the rising spiritual inspirations of these days. Is it not possible to bring groups together in all the communities of Christendom and have a programme of prayer in order to bring to God and to our brothers hearts of penitence?

Very sincerely,

Anthony Openeye.

EDITORIAL

FOURTH QUADRENNIAL MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

THE most powerful movement for Christian unity in the world to-day is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It arose at the right time. It arose in the right way. It arose to make permanent the ideals of Christianity in practical coöperation of American Protestants in service rather than in an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity. It has grown since its organization in 1908—not particularly in numerical strength beyond the normal growth of the American communions that came in it at its beginning and that are still in its membership—but it has grown in the thought of the nation, grown in its statesmanlike grasp in the great problems that concern the Church, grown in its practical efficiency in meeting the needs of the times, and grown in favor with God and man.

Its fourth quadrennial meeting in Boston last month revealed its place in the American Church life as no other of its quadrennial meetings has ever done. That does not mean the programme and addresses were better than in any previous meeting. They were of a high standard as they always have been, but the Council itself revealed its service to American and world-wide Christianity, its undisputed place of priority in American Christian coöperation, and its permanency in the Christian life of the nation. It has taken time to do all this, but that these things have been accomplished is not only a satisfaction but a prophecy of closer affiliation of Protestant forces and the assurance of a deeper righteousness for the nation and the world.

Its programme dealt with the present day opportunity

and obligation of the Church as related to the national government, social justice, the American ideals, our heritage from the Pilgrim fathers, facing the future, our present interdenominational situation, our service in the community, conditions in the rural community, Christian internationalism, a world-wide brotherhood, including our obligations to the Orient, to Latin America and to the Churches in Europe and European and Asiatic relief work, our missionary responsibility in both home fields and foreign lands, statements from coöperative movements, social problems, temperance crusade, Christian education, prayer and preparation for the future. The speakers gave utterance to messages of worth. Aside from our American speakers were the Rev. R. C. Gillie, president elect of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, the Rev. Alexander Ramsey, former moderator of the Presbyterian Church in England, and General Robert Georges Nivelles, delegate from the French Protestant Federation. Besides these there were representatives from other lands, such as China, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mexico and Switzerland.

The published reports of the commissions and committees include valuable data. It is to be hoped that these will be published in a single volume for a careful study. They present the work of the commissions dealing with international justice and good-will, relations with religious bodies in Europe, relations with France and Belgium, relations with the Orient, Christian education, evangelism, Church and social service, Church and common life, Negro Churches, temperance, foreign missions, interchurch federations, army and navy chaplains, religious press, religious outlook, American Bible Society. etc.

The report of the Committee on Methods of Coöperation included the following recommendations:

1. The Council believes that the time has come for fuller action on its part in the fulfillment of the purpose of its establishment "for the prose-

cution of work that can be better done in union than in separation." The Council instructs the Executive and Administrative Committees to plan the work of the Council in accordance with this view, ever having in mind its duly defined field of constitutional action and taking such steps as will maintain the closest possible relationships between it and the constituent denominations.

2. The Council instructs the Executive Committee to strengthen the secretarial staff of the Council by the appointment of such additional secretaries as it may deem necessary to enable the Council to carry forward a larger work with the confidence and support of the Churches.

3. The Council requests the constituent bodies to provide for the support of the Council and its work on the scale of \$300,000 per annum for the next two years, and it asks these bodies to accept their per capita apportionment of this amount.

4. The Council agrees to call such a conference of the inter-board agencies as has been suggested, for the purposes specified, with the understanding that any general plan of coöperation involving the denominations in any way not already approved by them in connection with the Federal Council or the inter-board bodies must be referred to the denominational courts or other authorities.

5. The Council approves the statement of the Committee on Methods of Coöperation with regard to the readiness of the Council to adjust its organization, within its constitutional character and responsibility to the Churches, in any way that may be necessary to enable it to be of service to the Churches or to any of their agencies.

6. The Council refers to the Administrative Committee with power the article numbered eight, of the By-laws, with regard to the Commissions of the Council, and authorizes it to make any changes which it may deem wise in the commission and committee organization (including the Administrative Committee itself) of the Council.

7. The Council expresses the hope that out of the experiences and discussions of the present time there may come the achievement of a richer form of expression of that "spirit of fellowship, service, and coöperation" in which the Federal Council began and which it is its duty and its joy to promote.

In the last session the report of the Committee on Message to the Churches was presented. This message is timely, urgent and prophetic. It says:

First of all, then, we would set our own hearts right with God. Unless our motives be single, and our surrender unreserved, God Himself cannot do through us what He desires. In all humility, therefore, we would confess before Him our sins, praying Him to purge us of our pride and self-complacency and by His Spirit to create in us that mind of Christ which shall fit us to minister in His name to a world in need.

Next we would thank God for the new demonstration which the war has brought of the unshakable foundation upon which our faith is laid: for the clear revelation of the central place which religion holds in the life of men; for the confirmation of Christ's teaching concerning the unity of mankind and our membership in one another; for the sharpening of the contrast between the way of self and the way of the cross; for the extent to which already in our standards, both personal and social, we judge success or failure by the ideals of Christ. With special gratitude would we recognize the increasing experience of coöperation among the Churches which the war has brought, our growing confidence in one another, our resolute purpose,

God helping us, to carry to completion the work which in His name we have begun.

What is this work to which our Master summons us? It is to help men everywhere to realize the kind of life that befits free personalities who accept the standards of Jesus Christ. We must show men not by word only, but by deed, what Christian discipleship means for men living in such a world and facing such conditions as confront us to-day—what it means for the family, what it means for industry, what it means for the relation of race to race and of nation to nation.

We must show them what it means for the family. In the home God has given us in miniature a picture of what He means His world to be—a society in which the welfare of each is the concern of all and he is greatest who serves most. The home in the nursery of religion and where family life is neglected, the family altar forgotten, the sanctity of marriage questioned, the opportunity lost which the Lord's day affords for rest, fellowship and spiritual nurture, and pleasure substituted for duty as the law of life, there can be small hope of producing men and women who will be Christian in their business and their civic life.

We must show men what Christian discipleship means for industry. Whether it be manufacturing or commerce, farming or finance, all forms of business are primarily concerned with human personalities, in whom Christ's Church has a rightful interest, and need for their true success the mutual confidence and helpfulness His Spirit inspires. We have recognized this in principle in the "Social Creed of the Churches." The time has come to prove our faith by our works. We must make human welfare our test of business success and judge the machinery of industry by what it does for those who use it. We must grant to those who labor the same freedom of association and representation which those who own capital claim for themselves and require of both alike that they use this right of association, freely granted, for the interest of all those whose welfare is dependent upon the product of their work.

We must show what discipleship means for the relation between men of different races. Deeper than all differences of color is our kinship of spirit in the family of God. This kinship requires mutual respect and the free expression of the aspirations of personality, and should lead to the persistent endeavor on the part of all to secure justice and fair dealing in all human relationships and to safeguard the rights of all peoples to their share in our common heritage of Christian democracy.

We must show what discipleship means for our international relations. With all the power we can command we must protest against the claim that the nation is exempt from the obligation of the moral law which controls the life of the individual. We bear our witness that God requires of the nation as of the individual to do justly and to love mercy, and that the nation which violates that law in its dealings with other nations He will hold to account. Of the nation as of the individual it is true that the way of love and trust is the way of salvation, and that he that would be greatest must be servant of all. We welcome, therefore, the development of a League of Nations which shall be in truth an association of free peoples for the achieving of world peace, for mutual disarmament, and for constructive service, and we call upon our own nation to join with other nations in moving along this new pathway of hope.

Above all, we must show what Christian discipleship means for the individual human life. Home and business and nation and race will be what the men and women who compose them make them. Most important, therefore, of all the responsibilities that rest upon the Church to-day is it to educate men and women and children in the meaning of the Gospel and its consequences for the life of the individual and of society. Through our

Churches and Sunday schools, in our schools and colleges, by the printed and the spoken word, by all the avenues through which mind touches mind, we must bring our Christian message home with convincing power.

But that our witness may be effective, our conduct must match our profession. A self-centered Church cannot rebuke the selfishness of business. A self-complacent Church is helpless before the arrogance of race. A Church which is itself the scene of competition and strife is impotent in face of the rivalries of the nations. When men see Christians forgetting their differences in common service, then and not till then will they believe in Christ's power to break down the barriers between classes and between races.

We welcome, therefore, the voice that comes to us across the sea from our fellow Christians in Lambeth, joining with us in calling the Churches to more complete unity. We reciprocate the spirit of their most Christian utterance. We believe with them that we are already one in Christ and are persuaded that the way to manifest the spiritual unity which we now possess, and to make possible its increase in ever enlarging measure, is for all those who love our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ to join in discharging the common duties whose obligation all alike recognize.

In this hour fraught with the possibilities of healing or of disaster, one thing only can save the nations and that is a will to united service, born of faith in the triumph of the good. To this faith we summon all men in the name of Him who died that we might live and who is able by His spirit to bring out of the failure and disappointment of the present a far more abundant and satisfying life. In this faith we would rededicate ourselves to the service of the living God, whose Kingdom is righteousness and peace and joy.

The Council continues at its task with renewed vision and courage. It was a real satisfaction that Dr. Robert E. Speer consented to be president for the next four years. Dr. Speer is the prophet of missionary zeal and the interpreter of Christian idealism. His leadership commands confidence in all parts of the Church. To carry forward the work of the Council, while the fine statesmanship of Dr. Charles S. MacFarland has manifested through the years, there must be larger coöperation on the part of the constituent bodies, and there will be. The permanent values of the Council are becoming evident to all and definite coöperation augments its strength for the fulfillment of its purposes in the enrichment of spiritual experience and common betterment.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

WHILE much is being said to-day about the union of Christian communions it is important to see that each communion maintains union within itself, for if those of the same communion cannot live together in peace it is not much likelihood that they will be able to live together with others. Speaking for the Church of England, and it applies to all other Churches, *The Challenge*, London, says:

The offering of a perfect service cannot be presented to God without a movement of reconciliation: It must come to a dead stop: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." It is to this great preliminary we are called upon to address ourselves. All eager as we are to set out hot foot on reuniting the Church, and reconstructing the world, we have to learn that we are no better than lame men starting on a Marathon race till this matter of internal unity has been put right.

So long as one party looks upon another as an unnecessary or even a necessary evil, so long will this internecine warfare continue. So long as insecurity prevails, there will always be the threat of war—so long as parties practise reprisals by seeking to "capture" parishes from one another, good feeling is impossible. A better way must be found to guarantee, within the widest limits possible, freedom and continuity to all schools of thought, and to deliver at the same time our helpless parishes from violent and autocratic changes of ritual and doctrine. After such a commission has done its work in the name of the whole Church the moral basis of discipline will have been laid. At present no such moral basis exists, and the isolated and uncertain position of bishops, dealing with ritual excesses or Protestant defects, is most deplorable.

* * * * *

The opportunity before the Church of England is so great that it would be a thousand pities if we should throw it away by our failure to agree. We are living in the fierce light of publicity at present in virtue of the encyclical of the bishops of our communion which challenge the attention of the world. Our sincerity and our credentials to pose as peacemakers are being subjected to the most penetrating gaze. Can we verify the hopes that we have raised by achieving reunion amongst ourselves?

The Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane in a recent address on reunion said:

It is useless even to discuss reunion until we are assured of one fundamental postulate. We are to "try the spirits," and the spirit of re-

union will be recognized as of God, just in so far as it is marked by *penitence*. Reunion, no doubt, is in the air. We are all weary of the practical inconvenience of our divisions. We all lament—and we in Australia perhaps more than most—the hindrance and scandal of half-a-dozen denominations struggling in one small township, with all manner of petty competition and jealousy, while the ministers of religion live in semi-starvation. Moreover we are all ashamed of the spectacle of the world crying out for a Christianity which we Christians are unable to give because we speak with a divided voice. But reunion is not a mere policy which we can adopt on practical grounds. Reunion is necessary because it is God's will; because, in spite of all our sins, the Church remains one in the mind of Christ. And the process of getting back to that mind and will is not a process of adjustment or programmes: it presupposes an awakening in men's souls, and a new surrender of all men's wills to the guidance of God's spirit. God's purpose, we believe, is to bring home the fruits of redemption to the world by means of a united Church: but by yielding to the spirit of schism, by admitting pride and worldliness into her counsels, the Church has fallen away from the divine purpose which called her into being. Only through penitence and humiliation can she set free the healing and renewing Spirit of God.

And our penitence must be *personal* penitence. We are not merely to confess the sins of our fathers in whose days the historical steps of division were taken. The sins which divide are with us still; and if we acknowledge that our fathers erred, we must confess and repent of the same sins in ourselves. But the penitence must also be *general*. All sections of the divided Church have their share of the guilt; and we must school ourselves to recognize that schism is not only the act of those who wilfully tear the Body of Christ; but that all who acquiesce in the divisions which have wounded our Lord, all who fail to do their utmost to right the great wrong (however little they may be responsible for it) are harboring the schismatic temper in their hearts. While, therefore, we of the Church of England seek to banish the spirit of schism from ourselves, we appeal to all our fellow-Christians to vie with us in the same endeavour.

The first essential then is to create an universal atmosphere of penitence. Without this, all our discussions will only lead to a hardening of our divisions. With it, all things are possible.

In a recent sermon on "Reunion: The Lambeth Appeal and the Concordat," the Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, New York, said:

As to the question of the ministry, this appeal speaks with a clearness and in a spirit which should commend it to the careful consideration of all Christians. It makes great gain by taking this question in the order which belongs to it. We have fallen into much difficulty through taking this important matter out of its right place and relation. The first and supreme fact is our fellowship in the Church. This fact clearly recognized as it is here, we can then go on more intelligently, and far more hopefully, to consider the question of the ministry.

The declaration acknowledges whole-heartedly the spiritual reality and efficacy of the non-episcopal ministries. It declares the necessity for the united Church of a "ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body," a statement with which all should agree.

It then offers the episcopate as "the one means of providing such a ministry." This statement that the episcopate is "the one means of providing such a ministry" for the whole united Church is one to which many leading Nonconformists to-day fully assent.

And then follows what so pronounced a Catholic and so able a theologian as Father Herbert Kelly describes as "the unique grandeur" of this declaration, the statement that although we cannot repudiate our ministry any more than we ask others to repudiate theirs, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from the authorities of other communions "a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations as having its place in the one family life." This offer by the bishops has been interpreted by some as made only to the Roman Catholic and Eastern Churches. Such an interpretation, however, is quite incorrect. The offer is made especially to the non-episcopal communions and the language of the declaration makes this clear. It is in fact based upon an offer made in almost identical words by the Bishop of Zanzibar to the representatives of the Protestant communions in East Africa. The chairman of the committee which drew up this declaration, the Archbishop of York, has himself made the following comment on this offer:

"I was born, brought up and baptized in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. I was received into the Episcopal Church and am now an archbishop. I should esteem it a privilege and an added consecration, and of course no repudiation of my orders, if our relations with the Presbyterian Church were such that I could now receive such ordination or commission from the Church of my fathers as would enable me to minister in the Presbyterian Church and to administer the Lord's Supper to its people; and I should feel that no Presbyterian minister would repudiate his ministry if he should receive ordination at my hands, and while still remaining a minister of the Presbyterian Church be able to administer the Lord's Supper in the Church of England."

One more matter. How does this great declaration by the bishops of the Anglican Communion bear upon that practical proposal for approach towards unity now under consideration by our communion and known as the concordat? I have seen some published statements which seemed to imply that the concordat failed to receive support because the Lambeth declaration does not mention it by name. Nothing, however, could be more unwarranted than such an inference.

Quite naturally and necessarily the declaration does not mention the concordat by name any more than it mentions the various other proposals of like character which are under consideration in different parts of the world. But the Lambeth Conference had before it in a small, carefully prepared volume all the recently proposed approaches towards reunion, among them a proposal by the Bishop of London for union with the Wesleyan Methodists, a proposal by the Bishop of Zanzibar for union with the Protestant communions in East Africa, and our own proposed concordat with the Congregationalists. These three proposals are the same in principle and are strikingly similar in their main provisions. Each of them provides that ministers, after receiving episcopal ordination, shall continue to minister in their own communions. Each is based on the very principles embodied in the Lambeth declaration. And I think those of you who are familiar with both documents will feel that I do not overstate the case when I say that the Lambeth declaration countenances and supports every principle of the concordat, and in some important points goes further in the direction of concession than the concordat does. Compared with the declaration on unity made by the bishops at Lambeth, the concordat is a rather conservative proposal. On the very lines laid down by this declara-

tion it is an experiment in the direction of reunion, but a very carefully guarded one. And how shall we ever make any progress unless we are willing to make some experiments? If the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Zanzibar are willing to recommend such an experiment, why should it throw any of us into panic?

The Living Church, Milwaukee, dissents from Dr. Manning's interpretation and says:

We feel impelled rather to question Dr. Manning's belief that the concordat has been practically endorsed by the Lambeth Conference. That that instrument was a considerable factor in moulding the thought of the bishops we do not question; but the chief issues in connection with the concordat are generally not such as are treated in the Appeal.

Moreover the concordat is so immeasurably superior to most of the proposals printed in the pamphlet mentioned and especially to the results of the Mansfield Conferences in England, that it would not be strange if many Anglican Churchmen should take it as a basis for further study. On the other hand we can think of nothing more deplorable than the assumption by the proponents of the concordat of a "Take-it-or-leave-it" attitude. If they cling to the concordat as drawn, with its defects uncorrected, there is nothing left for the Church but absolute rejection; which would be a disappointing outcome, indeed, to the very serious attempt made by men a generation ahead of their time, on both sides, to find an approach toward unity. They may safely ignore such criticisms as are simply unintelligent, but they cannot ignore such, for instance, as those that were contained in the series of papers by Professor Francis J. Hall which were published in *The Living Church* a year ago. Those papers raised issues that the proponents of the concordat have not met. It was, in our judgment, a mistake for them to carry into General Convention a document containing defects for which no attempt at correction had been made. And particularly the resolutions in which General Convention declared most sympathetically what general form of alterations in the proposals must be made before favorable consideration could be hoped for cannot be ignored. If the Joint Commission should fail to secure the coöperation of the Congregational conferees in those suggestions it would be better that no proposals whatever should be reported into the next General Convention. Few, indeed, are those who would desire, by their vote, to commit the Church to an unqualifiedly *non possumus* attitude in response to the serious overtures of Dr. Smyth and his associates, but the alternative is to draw up a new agreement on the general lines of those resolutions, after the most careful study of the constructive criticism that has been given to the subject. It is by no means certain that relations such as were proposed could become a really workable system, even if the defects in the concordat were cured. That is a subject for careful consideration by the conferees. If it be possible for the Congregationalist commission, in conference with our own, to work out details on those lines, a very long step toward unity will be taken. But everything depends upon the details.

In the Lambeth Conference four bishops voted against the Appeal. Among them was the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, Bishop of Vermont. In an address to his diocese he gives the following explanation why he voted as he did:

While, with the use of a good deal of skill, the Appeal and its consequent resolutions may be defended and interpreted by us in an orthodox or catholic sense, it will not be so understood by many of those to whom it is addressed. In particular:

(1) I feel sure that many—American Congregationalists, for example—will make no distinction, as to the conferring of divine authority (which is the real matter of importance), between the episcopal ordination which we offer their ministers, and the “commission or recognition” which we profess to be ready in turn to receive from their ecclesiastical authorities, other terms of reunion being satisfactorily adjusted. Our own words seem to express the object of this mutual reordination (if it may be so called) to be only the giving or gaining of a wider sphere of ministry, not any added guarantee of a divine commission.

In their desire (admirable in itself) to make terms of reunion as easy as possible for others, and to avoid on their own part an attitude of superiority, the bishops seem really to have abandoned all of strength and authority that goes with the inheritance of a ministerial commission handed down from the Apostles to whom it was originally given by our Lord Jesus Christ. There is no mention throughout the Appeal of this transmission. The episcopate they—I cannot but think inconsistently—insist on for the future, but chiefly, if not wholly, for utilitarian advantages as an instrument of unity—which it has not always shown itself! By these terms we should sanction a low view of ordination, both among those admitted on these easy conditions, and among the next generation of ministers whom they might encourage to be ordained on a similar understanding.

(2) According to the Appeal the Catholic Church is an object of hope rather than of faith. It is the Church for which we look, rather than the body with its divinely appointed organization to which, however outwardly maimed, we recall men. Accordingly there is no word of condemnation for a schismatical position, however largely to be excused in the present members of separated bodies.

(3) During the time of transition, which must extend over a number of years, there would be the accepted anomaly of a number of ministers who, not having received episcopal ordination, would be allowed to preach and conduct services in our Churches, but not to celebrate the Holy Communion, and who would be full members of diocesan and other synods.

(4) Apparently—though this is not explicitly stated in the Appeal, but is defended by some of its warm supporters—“groups” would still be recognized in the reunited Church. There might be Presbyterian and Methodist and Congregational and Anglican and Roman Catholic groups existing side by side, but retaining differences of administration and worship, within a given area (say the state of Vermont), if only each had its bishop; and held in communion one with another by their several bishops being all members of one synod. Now I am bold to say that this sort of reunion seems hardly worth striving for. To my mind there must be unity of chief pastorship in each area, whatever arrangement of suffragan or assistant bishops might be devised for different sets of people, as for different races. The appeal to the Uniate Churches among Roman Catholics does little to strengthen the case. They are comparatively insignificant in numbers, and their history is by no means satisfactory. I long ago expressed my willingness to retire from office myself if a new bishop might be chosen who would be acceptable to a united Church, as free from former antagonisms. But overlapping jurisdictions promise no real union, but seem fruitful in rivalries and trouble.

(5) The testing of an agreement arrived at by a good deal of mutual concession, if not of compromise, comes when it is put into practical execu-

tion. Then the different understandings with which various persons have agreed to the common statement are likely to appear. Here, I fear, exists a risk of further controversy and division. The bishops who by an overwhelming majority adopted the Appeal and its consequent resolutions will, I feel sure, feel bound to do their utmost to preserve the balance of the agreement and to guard against the possible dangers and risks which many of them recognize and of which all have been fairly warned.

(6) I must not omit what I placed first among my objections stated to the Conference, my inability to accept the dogmatic assumption—clean contrary to the teaching of many Fathers, *e. g.*, St. Augustine, and of other authorities—at the beginning of the Appeal, that Baptism alone—by whomsoever ministered, in whatsoever body (*e. g.*, Mormons), and with whatsoever intention—constitutes membership in the Body of Christ, without any sanction or reconciliation by the laying on of hands. Confirmation is regarded not as the appointed completion of the initiatory rites of the Christian Church, but as a desirable but not really necessary addition. Apparently a minister of another religious body might be ordained without first receiving the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

The Southern Churchman, Richmond, dissents from Bishop Hall's position and says:

One can but marvel that such objections as these should outweigh in any mind the broad Christian spirit and truly catholic principles set forth in the noble and generous Appeal for the Reunion of the Church of Christ made by the *almost* unanimous voice of the assembled bishops at Lambeth. They indicate the honest convictions of a certain number of the members of this Church which they are at perfect liberty to hold in high value and to teach, a liberty which no advocate of unity desires to deprive them of. But they are not required of any man to be believed by this Church, and as a matter of fact are not held, or are held with modifications and interpretations of wide variance, by a vast multitude of perfectly good and orthodox Churchmen who are in full ecclesiastical fellowship with the excellent Bishop of Vermont. Yet for the sake of insistence upon these views he would condemn all Christians outside of this Church who cannot accede to them to remain perpetually in what he considers a "schismatical position," and deny to them the fellowship within the Church which he is obliged to accord to his brother Churchmen who hold the same Protestant opinions. From the Bishop's own point of view, could inconsistency further go?

Dr. F. D. Kershner writing in *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, regarding the certain and inevitable breakdown in denominationalism, says:

1. The first reason is the contradiction of the ideal of Christian love and brotherhood, fostered by the denominational order. The ethics of Jesus center around the ideal of love and the practical expression of that ideal in deeds of good-will and of human brotherhood. Anything which makes it hard for Christians to love each other is foreign to the genius of Christianity. Love is fundamental, and basic in the teaching of Jesus. Whatever contravenes the gospel of love is necessarily the deadliest of all heresies. Now, no one can deny that denominationalism has made it difficult for the spirit of love to exist in the hearts of Christians. The rivalry of

parties and sects has inevitably tended toward the development of bitterness and hatred. Thomas Campbell in the Declaration and Address published in 1809 calls especial attention to the crying sin of denominationalism in this particular.

2. On the practical side, even the most earnest advocates of the denominational order must concede its inefficiency. Overlapping and waste have everywhere characterized the religious activities of modern Protestantism. The burden of expense entailed by the Great War has made this unnecessary cost in the religious field intolerable. While this viewpoint is by no means the most essential, or the most significant, it nevertheless carries great weight with the average present-day Christian. Denominationalism is inefficient, therefore denominationalism must go.

3. From the standpoint of philosophical unity it is inconceivable that the pluralistic conception of the Church should be ultimate. Doubtless the ideal of unity carries with it a full recognition of the necessity for individual freedom, but the fact remains that an ultimate pluralism is as unthinkable in the field of practical religion as it is in the field of metaphysics or theology.

4. In the fourth place, the denominational order cannot be reconciled with many of the most significant passages of the New Testament. Especially is this true of our Lord's intercessory prayer in the seventeenth chapter of the gospel of John. Certainly the ideal of unity expressed in this chapter precludes the denominational order as an ultimate expression of the life of the Church. The same thing is true of the language of the Apostle Paul as contained in the first chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Denominational apologists seek in vain to destroy the force of these and other similar passages of Scripture.

5. Finally, denominationalism, whatever may have been its original merits, has fully served its day. It is as out-worn and out-grown in the new world of the twentieth century as the Holy Roman Church was at the dawn of the Reformation. It was doubtless well that freedom should be secured even at the cost of unity, but now that freedom has been secured it is impossible that the separatist ideal should rule forever. Daniel Webster's noble words with regard to the political situation apply just as fully and conclusively to the field of religion—"Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable." We have had union without liberty, and liberty without union; it is time that we should make liberty and union one and inseparable.

Writing in *The Australian Christian Commonwealth*, Rev. George Hall says:

It has been said that to vote for the surrender of our distinctive name and polity would be an act of disloyalty to the Church to which we owe so much. Is the bride guilty of an act of disloyalty to the old home when on the wedding day she accepts a new name and begins a larger life?

We shall surely gain by the inclusion of some of the things which the other negotiating Churches have proved to be of value. The teachings and polity and spirit which are peculiarly ours so far as they are essential to a New Testament Church we shall carry with us, and by so doing enrich all.

The question that is worthy of Christian leaders and all Christian people is not, shall I part with any denominational appellation? shall I surrender the modes of thought and form of service which by long use have become as a part of my very nature? but, will the union of the Churches make for the growth of the Kingdom of God?

The Methodism to which many of us owe more than to any other institution is very precious to us, but far above that to us is the accelerated movement of Christ's Church.

If one strong Church in a small community can more effectively do the work of God than can two or three weak ones, who shall stand for the perpetuating of the less effective method? Why expend large stores of energy and vast sums of money on an over-churched community when there are upwards of 1,000,000,000 for whom our Lord died who do not know His name?

The question of economy must and ought to come into the consideration of Church union.

Our Mission Boards are pleading for men and money. In some districts not far from our shores the heathen are crying out, "Come over . . . and help us." Shall we not consolidate our home forces and liberate the men who can be spared that they may serve our common cause in those places where the enemy is unopposed?

Another writer in the same journal says:

We take it for granted that advocates and opponents of union alike are moved by the desire to do the right thing and to serve the Church universal. But more is needed than right motives. Error may be honest. Sincerity is not the same thing as truth. Rightness of vision, correctness of thought, soundness of judgment, all are necessary. If the view is narrowed to one's own denomination, one's own town, or state, or country, a correct judgment is not likely to be arrived at. If the level from which the matter is looked at is that of finance, polity, denominational importance, the true objective will be missed. The outlook must be world-wide in its comprehensiveness and heavenly in its attitude. The divisions of the Christian Church have been caused largely by the blunders of men who have been narrow and earth bound. They can only be healed by those yet on the mount of God. The world to-day is vastly different from the world of the centuries when the great sections of the Church were created. It is just as impossible to perpetuate denominational exclusiveness as it is to keep up national barriers. Walled cities are an anachronism. Education, commerce, invention, have made it impossible for a nation to live to itself. The new method of Bible study is just as surely making it impossible for differences to continue which were due very largely to a wrong use of the Scriptures. Christianity must be spread by dealing with the essentials, or become stagnant and retrogressive.

Clear thinking must be accompanied by right emotions. This duty cannot be discharged coldly. It is not a surface thing. It has not been created by assemblies of ecclesiastics. It has been produced by years of coöperation on the part of young people in Christian Endeavor Societies, young men and women in Christian associations, ministers and laymen meeting in fraternals and conventions, interchange of pulpits. We were wont to live in our own little circles and think ourselves the people of the Lord and all others heathen or misguided half-enlightened people who were to be pitied. To make proselytes was regarded as equal to making converts from the world. Possibly that spirit still lingers, but it is as much out of date as tallow candles and horse trams. It cannot live where men know and love each other.

From the recent meeting of the business committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, Rt. Rev.

Charles H. Brent, chairman, and Robert H. Gardiner, secretary, the following action is reported:

That the minutes of all meetings of the business committee be sent to all members of the continuation committee and to all members of all the commissions;

That the secretary be authorized to print and distribute the Geneva report, and that the treasurer be authorized to pay the cost;

That a compilation of proposals for reunion, including the Lambeth Appeal and Proposals, the English ad interim reports and other documents, be printed and sent to the entire mailing-list, and that the treasurer be instructed to meet the expense;

That latitude be extended to the secretary to take advantage of opportunities for distributing material from foreign periodicals about the movement, and that the treasurer be instructed to meet the expense.

The secretary reported that ten thousand dollars appropriated by the Episcopal Commission was available in the hands of the treasurer; that he had received at Geneva twenty-eight pounds sterling from a delegate from the Church of Ireland; that he had paid five hundred dollars to the Bishop of Bombay for the subjects committee; that Bishop Brent had received and paid over to the secretary for the treasurer a gift of five hundred dollars for the work, and that the secretary had received the five hundred dollars promised at Geneva by the Disciples of Christ in North America and several small sums from other sources.

It was voted that the following amounts be appropriated for the expenses of six months beginning September 1, 1920: clerical assistance, \$3,250; office rent, \$400; translations, \$750; office expense, including postage, \$5,000; printing, \$5,000; subjects committee, including \$500 already paid over to its convener, \$750; travelling expenses, \$500; contingencies, \$350—\$16,000.

Suggestions sent out by Robert H. Gardiner, secretary of the World Conference on Faith and Order, for opening devotions at group conferences on Christian unity:

Let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our strength and our redeemer.

Our Father who art in heaven.

O God, forasmuch as without Thee we are not able to please Thee; Mercifully grant that Thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Grant to us, Lord, we beseech Thee, the spirit to think and do always such things as are right; that we, who cannot do any thing that is good without Thee, may by Thee be enabled to live according to Thy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O God, who on the mount didst reveal to chosen witnesses Thine only-begotten Son wonderfully transfigured, in raiment white and glistering; mercifully grant that we, being delivered from the disquietude of this world, may be permitted to behold the King in His beauty, Who with Thee, O Father, and Thee, O Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. *Amen.*

O God, the Holy Ghost, Spirit of wisdom and love and power, illuminate and strengthen those who have been appointed to bring about a World Conference on the Faith and Order of Thy Church. Give them patience and courage, humility, love and steadfastness, and utter obedience to Thy

guidance. Fill the hearts of all Christian people with the desire to manifest to the world by their unity its Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, so that His Kingdom of peace and righteousness and love may be established and all men may be drawn to Him, Who with Thee and the Father liveth and reigneth one God forever. *Amen.*

Here should be read St. John 17 or Ephesians IV, 1-16.

Let us pray, silently:—

that our eyes may be opened to see how our divisions blur the vision of the one Lord and hide Him from His world.

that each may see how he is individually responsible for the continuance of those divisions.

that each may give up any pride of opinion, all self-assertion, any sectarian partisanship, any denominational pride.

that each may see the fundamental value of the things for which other Churches stand;

the fundamental value of the things for which his own Church stands and may be enabled in the deepest humility to make them a little clearer to his brethren;

that unity is of God and in God through Christ and not something we are free to accept or reject;

that we are powerless of ourselves to create unity;

that we can learn about unity,—not by thinking about it and planning for it,—but by beginning to practice it; that he that doeth the will of the Father shall learn of the doctrine.

that we may have grace to keep the unity of the Spirit.

that God will take our wills and make them wholly His.

that so dwelling at one in Christ and He in us, we may manifest Him Who is Love Incarnate and bring His world to Him.

O God, Lover, Beloved and Love proceeding, Eternal Three in One, give us grace to fulfill the new commandment that we should love one another as Thou hast loved us, so that, in the unity which is true love and life eternal, we may be visibly one that the world may come to know its Redeemer and King. *Amen.*

And may the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

SOME POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE NON-LITURGICAL CHURCHES

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:—The rapidity with which we are moving in the matter of Christian unity suggests the desirability of pointing out the opportunity which the situation will seemingly present to some at least of the non-liturgical Churches to recover practices long lost to Christian worship and customs long disused in Christian administration.

Let us take the opportunities which will apparently in the near future be open to the two communions which have made the most pronounced advance in the direction of reunion with historic Christianity—the Presbyterian and the Congregationalist.

In the case of the former great stress has always been laid on the powers and the responsibilities of the presbyterate the divinely appointed agency for the transmission of the teaching of the Church and the administration of its Sacraments to the members of the congregations. In this regard they join hands with the great theologians of the Middle Ages, who repudiated the theory that the bishops comprised a separate order in the Christian ministry, and maintained that, while there could be a special office of administration for the furthering of certain features of the Church's work, there could be no order superior to that to which was entrusted the conservation of the Eucharist and the charge of the cure of souls: a situation which has left its mark on the Anglican Book of Common Prayer,* as well as on the practice of the parish priest in the Roman Church of to-day, who prepares his candidates for and administers to them their first communion before and not after their confirmation by the bishop.

Now it is in connection with this situation that the opportunity arises for the recovery of a significant lost practice in the matter of ecclesiastical administration. The Presbyterian Church has in its power to enrich the patrimony of the Church at large by the reestablishment of what is known as the collegiate or consistorial episcopate. Met with almost everywhere among Greek speaking Christians of the post-apostolic time; prevailing in Alexandria till at least the middle of the third century, and in some parts of Egypt for a century longer; persevering in the Church of Armenia apparently until the middle of the thirteenth century, when contact with the customs of the west through intercourse with the crusaders led gradually to its abandonment—the collegiate episcopate emphasized what I may perhaps be allowed to call the democracy of the learned, or the specially trained, of which we find so many expressions in the life of the medieval universities and guilds, and of which a striking example exists to-day in the action of the papal consistory and in the rules and practices of the French Academy.

The Presbyterian Church, then, would perhaps do well—if an outsider may hazard an opinion—to consider the desirability of reviving this form of the episcopate, which is free from some of the disadvantages of the monarchical form as this has been exemplified in the Church of England, and is peculiarly in keeping with the impulses which are moving man to-day, and with the spirit and the practice of those communities in which the Church secured her earliest and most compelling triumphs.

*See Preface to the Ordinal, Book of Common Prayer, p. 509.

In the case of the Congregational Church, whose work in the matter of reunion is one of the most encouraging signs of the times in the field of our American Christianity, the opportunity to enrich the common patrimony along the line which it has long since made its own, in stressing the corporate note in the local congregation, is equally apparent. Strange as it may appear, for something like fifteen centuries no group of Christians anywhere has confessed its faith in the words of the Nicene Creed. By what would seem to be the purest accident the private confession of a single diocese (that of Salamis in Cyprus) found its way into the baptismal offices and presently into the liturgies of the whole of Christendom; copious additions to the original instrument were recited in the belief that they were of ecumenical authority; and the world of to-day is confronted by the fact that the Church is everywhere using in its Eucharistic service a creed which has lost its corporate character and has been added to by private hands partly in the attempt to adapt it to the requirements of Baptism and partly in the desire to define explicitly certain things upon which the assembly at Nicaea did not see fit to make a pronouncement. It is the fact that no Christian on the face of the globe recited the Church's corporate creed in the Church's central act of corporate worship either in the plural form or in the shape in which it left the hands of the assembly which set it forth.

If therefore those Congregationalists who will presently be confronted with the opportunity to compile what will doubtless be a simpler Eucharistic office than has lately been used in Christendom should see their way to restore to the world the recital of the Nicene Creed in the plural form and in the shape in which it left the hands of its promulgators, they will confer a benefit on the Church at large of inestimable significance and add impressively to the content of modern liturgies.

If, further, the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches will, when the time comes for them to make provision for an office for the admission of the adolescent to the full fellowship of the mature in Christ, open the way for at least the permissive use of the mandatory form of the laying on of hands, and perhaps inject some touch of the heroic into the promise of the candidates such as distinguished the imitation of the pagan Greek into the fellowship of the politically adult in ancient Athens, they will deserve well at the hands of history and enrich the liturgical usages of mankind.

In the case of either body the power to do what is here suggested lies wholly in their own hands. The boldest and the most sanguine of us may only point out what seems to us to be congruous with their established positions, and so likely to approve itself to their favorable regard, in the hope that the Church as a whole may be strengthened and its practices catholicized rather than restricted in the developments that seem to be at hand.

As the reports which have come to us from Geneva have emphasized the fact that representatives of one of the Churches of Christendom were lacking to the deliberations of the conference, it will perhaps be permissible and gracious to remind the reader that it is to the Cardinal Secretary of the Vatican and to the Director of the *Ecole Française* in Rome*—the one the ablest of living canonists, the other the most illustrious authority on the history and the liturgies of the Western Church—that we owe the explicit enunciation, in the recent period, of the principle which should guide us as we move towards the reconstruction of our broken front: that nothing can be made essential to catholicity by any existing Christian body which was unknown to the Church in the days of its greatest triumphs while its fellowship was still at one.

*Formerly Professor Gasparri and Professor Duchesne of the College of the Sorbonne.

Will you let me add the personal confession that—in arriving at the conviction that nothing which the Church in her great constructive period found congenial to her spirit and agreeable to her purpose can be relegated to the sphere of the forbidden if we desire to retain the right to call ourselves Christians and to stand unchallenged at the bar of history—I have been helped by a great teacher† in a university, the destruction of whose tangible possessions at the hands of the Germans was one of the tragedies of the European War.

(REV.) WILLIAM HIGGS.

Oakland, California.

DR. HODGE ANSWERS DR. THOMAS REGARDING THE LATTER'S
INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMS PRIEST AND PROPHET
IN THE OCTOBER NUMBER OF THE QUARTERLY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:—An article appeared in the October number of THE QUARTERLY entitled “Priest or Prophet,” its object being to show that the Christian ministry is solely prophetic, in no sense a priesthood.

The object of this article is to claim that it possesses the characteristics both of priest and prophet.

The author of the article in question defines “the essence of the priesthood was the representation of man to God; the essence of the prophetic office was the representation of God to man.” Would not a more exact definition be, that a prophet is one who speaks to man on behalf of God, and a priest is one who acts as the agent both of men in their approach to God, and of God in His dealings with men?

The priest under the old dispensation not only offered sacrifice, and made intercession, etc., for the people, but he acted as God’s representative when he accepted the sacrifices of the people, when he sprinkled the blood of the atonement, when he laid his hands on the scapegoat, when he blessed the people, or performed any act of consecration. The article denies that there is anything corresponding to these acts in the Christian ministry. It says that “the twenty-seven books of the New Testament a single reference cannot be found to a special human priesthood.” But he overlooks Christ’s solemn statement to His Apostles, “as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.” If Christ then was a Priest, His Apostles must have shared in His Priesthood. This is made evident by the act which followed, “He breathed on them and said receive you the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.” This was more than merely commission to preach the gospel, it was to speak and act as the accredited agent of God. So was His command to baptize, and to celebrate the Lord’s Supper which was manifestly meant to take the place of the ancient sacrifices, to be the memorial of the salvation He wrought by His offering of Himself upon the Cross for all mankind, instead of a memorial for the deliverance of the children of Israel from their Egyptian bondage, or the making of an atonement for individual sins. And in doing this he uses the same words which were used in offering the Jewish sacrifices. So certainly in the Acts of the Apostles and in their Epistles, references are made to the administration, and the effects, of Baptism, to the laying on of hands as a means of the bestowal of

†Professor A. Van Hove, D.C.L., of the University of Louvain.

the Holy Spirit, of confirming and sealing of disciples, of conferring the commission of the Christian ministry, of the breaking of bread in accordance with Christ's appointment, of the anointing of the sick.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews it is distinctly claimed that "we have an altar" of which they who belonged to the old dispensation had no right to partake. And St. Peter teaches that all believers constitute "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices."

This spiritual priesthood of all believers the article admits, but denies that there is "any special order or class of men called priests." But the whole body of believers cannot act as one in performing priestly functions. It must have representatives to act for the whole body in its corporate approaches to God and there must be some one to celebrate and administer the acts which Christ commanded, and His Apostles preached, by means of which spiritual blessings are received from God.

This was recognized from the very first, and universally throughout the Christian Church this conception of the Christian ministry prevailed. Where can any body of Christians be pointed to, down to the time of the Reformation, that did not have this ministry and use these terms of altar, priest and sacrifice? And ever since the Reformation, those bodies which have discarded those terms, still have orders of ministers which do practically the same things. With the exception of the Friends, all Christian bodies have a ministry set apart as a special order to discharge these functions, as well as to be preachers of the Gospel. Every time a Protestant minister baptizes, or presides at the Lord's Supper, or lays on hands in confirmation or ordination, or leads in prayer, or pronounces a benediction, he is performing a priestly act, whether he calls it by that name or not.

Are not therefore these widely diverging views in regard to the character of the Christian ministry which is supposed to exist, really a matter of nomenclature, not of fact? It is not merely a matter of "decency and order," but a necessity that there should be, as there always and everywhere there has been, in the Christian Church, orders of specially trained and authoritatively commissioned men, first, to act as the agents and representatives of Christ, not only to preach, but to perform those acts which Christ ordained to be used in His Church, and secondly, to represent men in these corporate acts of worship, of prayer and praise and offering.

There is nothing derogatory to Christ's High Priesthood in such orders, as there was not anything derogatory to the office of the high priest, under the Jewish systems in the orders of priests and Levites. Christ offered Himself as the perfect and sufficient sacrifice for all human sins; the human priest only offers a representation of that sacrifice, recalls it to the mind of God, pleads its merits with Him, and sets it forth to men, with the benefits obtained by it. A priest is a mediator in the same sense that one who offers prayers for another, or tries to reconcile those at variance, is a mediator. Truly it is unwise to magnify the differences among Christians, and insist that varying views involve unreconcilable divergencies. Should we not rather seek to discover how far we do, or can, agree, though we may use different terms to express our meaning? If those who are accustomed to attach a certain meaning to certain words, would question with those who use them in another sense, they might find that there is not as much divergence between them as they had supposed. Thus those who maintain that the Christian minister is only a prophet or preacher, might come to acknowledge that in that ministry there are the elements both of the priesthood and the prophet.

Very sincerely yours,

G. WOOLSEY HODGE.

Rector Emeritus of the Diocesan Church of St. Mary, Philadelphia, Pa.

REPLIES TO DR. BROWN'S ARTICLE IN THE LAST QUARTERLY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY:

Dear Sir:—In THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY for October, appears an article with the title, "The Disciples' Programme for Union," by Prof. George W. Brown, Ph.D., Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky. Attention is called to the errors in that article.

First of all, it is inexact to say that the Disciples have gotten up a programme for union. They do not plead for a programme for union of their own making. They plead for union in accordance with the programme for union set forth in the divinely inspired Scriptures. They stand opposed to man-made programmes for union and plead for union upon the basis which Christ has Himself established, and which is, therefore, vastly better than any and all human plans for the union of Christians.

Again, the writer is inexact in his statement of the plea for union which is made by Disciples of Christ, or Christians only. He quotes two sentences from Thomas Campbell's "Declaration and Address," and makes some comments. Then he says,—

"It is unnecessary to go further into the early history of the Disciple movement. Enough has been said to make it clear that union was the primary thing in the movement. The programme for union was the whole programme. The platform might be stated as loyalty to Christ." He then in the next paragraph, represents that the idea of restoration was an after consideration, for he says,

"Perhaps half a century after its successful launching as a union movement, some began to feel that the primary purpose of the movement was the restoration of the conditions of the early Church, and they began to speak of the movement as the 'restoration movement.' In time this view began to be held by a large number of Disciples. They placed an ever increasing emphasis on restoration, with a constantly decreasing emphasis on Christian union." Five pages further on in Thomas Campbell's "Declaration and Address" there are thirteen propositions, to which this writer refers, and Mr. Campbell prefaces these propositions with this statement:

"They are merely designed for opening up the way that we may come fairly and firmly to original ground upon clear and certain premises; and take up things just as the Apostles left them.—That thus disentangled from the accruing embarrassments of intervening ages, we may stand with evidence upon the same ground on which the Church stood at the beginning."

Dr. Robert Richardson, in his *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, after quoting this statement, remarks: "Here, indeed, was the startling proposition to begin anew—to begin at the beginning; to ascend at once to the pure fountain of truth, and to neglect and disregard, as though they had never been, the decrees of popes, councils, synods and assemblies, and all the traditions and corruptions of an apostate Church. Here was an effort not so much for the reformation of the Church, as was that of Luther and of Calvin, and to a certain extent even that of the Haldanes, but for its complete restoration at once to its pristine purity and perfection. (*Memoirs of Alex. Campbell*, Vol. 1, p. 257).

It is evident, therefore, from the foregoing statement, of Thomas Campbell and Dr. Richardson's comment upon it, that the restoration idea was a part of this movement from the first, being embodied in Mr. Campbell's "Declaration and Address," and that the plea for Christian union which was made included also the divine basis of union to the exclusion of human creeds, traditions and authority. In other words, the plea for union as made over a century ago included both the programme for union and the method of attaining it. This is the "original union programme," and

only those who hold to the original method as well as its programme are true to the Restoration Movement. Those who "have not joined in the restoration programme" in order to Christian union have forsaken an essential part of the plea which the Disciples have made for more than a century for the union of Christians.

This writer further states, "But not all disciples have joined in the restoration programme. The majority of them still keep before them the original union programme. Necessarily, that programme has to be modified from time to time in some of its details along with the changing thought and life of the world."

This statement calls for two remarks.

1st. It is a frank avowal that some among the Disciples do not accept the restoration feature of this movement which was an essential part of it from the beginning. These are the ones who constitute an element of discord among the Disciples, and who have departed from the original programme. The writer, however, is very inexact as to the number, for instead of being the majority, they are only a small minority.

2nd. It is not true that this "programme has to be modified" in order to accommodate it to the "changing thought and life of the world." There is nothing in the original union programme that requires accommodation, for it is set forth in the inspired Scriptures and is established by no other authority than Jesus Christ Himself, who has all authority in heaven and on earth. It is a dangerous presumption for any man, or body of men, however pious or educated they may be, to modify or change the original programme established by Jesus Christ and proclaimed by His commissioned and inspired apostles. Half a century ago Isaac Errett wrote "We have no faith in the practicability of uniting sects on any merely sectarian basis, however liberal. It can not be Christian union unless it is union in Christ—in that which Christ enjoins, neither less nor more." In this statement Errett expressed the position of the Disciples and recent events confirm its correctness.

In the days of my youth, I heard preachers declare, "You should correct your views by the Bible, not the Bible by your views." That is a sound principle, and is just as correct to-day as it was sixty years ago. There should be no more talk about modifying the original Bible programme for union to the changing thought and life of the world. What is needed is for the religious world to return to the original and unchangeable programme of Jesus Christ for the union of Christians.

Respectfully and fraternally yours,

M. P. HAYDEN.

International Bible College, Minneapolis, Minn.

AMONG NEW BOOKS

One of the most practical and valuable volumes dealing with Christian unity is "Next Steps Toward Church Union" (Associated Press, New York), being the work of a special committee created by the Committee on the War and Religious Outlook of the American Federal Council of Churches under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert E. Speer. It is one of a series of studies being brought out by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, the first volume being "Religion Among American Men: As Revealed by a Study of Conditions in the Army," the second being "The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War," and the third being "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction."

This volume dealing with Christian unity is the fourth. The introduction is written by Professor William Adams Brown, the bearing of war experience on the movement toward Church union is written by Dr. Speer, the development of the denominations in American Christianity by Professor George W. Richards, movements for coöperation regardless of denominational lines by Professor Herbert L. Willett, coöperative movements in the early part of the nineteenth century by Professor Williston Walker, foreign missions and Christian unity by Rev. Arthur J. Brown and Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert, the Sunday-school and Christian unity by Rev. Henry M. Meyer, relations with the Roman Catholic Church by Professor Williston Walker, the present situation regarding unity in the various denominations such as Congregationalists, Disciples, Lutherans, Northern Baptists, Presbyterians and Protestant Episcopalians, present situation in local interdenominational coöperation by Rev. Alfred W. Anthony and Rev. Roy B. Guild, present interdenominational situation by Dr. Speer, present problems in the movement by Dr. William Adams Brown, closing with the statement of principles that underlie further progress, and an appendix.

It is a satisfactory attempt to analyze the rise of movements for unity, the forms which they have taken, the obstacles which impeded and the influences which helped, and to give reasonable guidance in laying plans for the future. It is a volume of estimable value. The eighteen points named under principles that underlie further progress may be briefly summed up as follows: (1) The desire for union is as old as Christianity, (2) nothing can stand or satisfy that is not built on the truth, (3) the movement toward a complete union must be a movement toward freedom, (4) union must rest upon inclusive, not exclusive, principles, (5) new forms of union must arise from the spirit of Christian unity already existing, (6) nothing is gained by ignoring the fact of the unwillingness of some bodies of Christians unwilling to unite with other Christians, (7) unity is not uniformity, (8) whatever

losses may have been involved in past divisions, compensations and enrichments have been gained, (9) the Body of Christ is one, (10) action is educative, (11) present consideration of union by cognate or affiliated Churches, (12) strengthening of present interdenominational coöperation, (13) agencies of coöperative action must be frankly and fairly representative and responsible, (14) all should sedulously cultivate the healing and uniting habits of mind and temper, (15) increase of interdenominational acquaintance and friendship, (16) strongest principle of unity within our permanent social experience is the principle that prevails in the family, (17) every good is costly, and (18) all Christians should form the habit of systematic study of all the problems involved in this whole complicated matter of the union of the life and power, the experience and obedience of the Christian Church. It closes with this strong paragraph: "Throughout the study we are ourselves conscious of having been in touch with a great and living movement which nothing can stop. If anything could end it, the weakness and errors and failings of men would have ended it long ago. They would end it to-day. But it is a movement whose origin guarantees its ultimate success. Our Lord prayed that all Christians might be one, in the deepest and most organic unity of which we can conceive. That for which our Lord prayed cannot fail."

"A Plea for Greater Unity," by Seth W. Gilkey, D.D. (Richard G. Badger, Publisher, Boston), is the outcome of an experience through which the author passed in the uniting of two rival congregations in an over-churched community. It is divided into four parts: (1) The movements toward unity, (2) barriers, (3) impelling forces, and (4) duties. It is a book of marked worth, well argued, clear and convincing. He sees the unity of Christians in the being and character of God, in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, in the Holy Spirit, in the common acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, in the conception of sin and realization of its ruin, in Christian duties, Christian virtues, in the nature and value of worship and in the value and importance of the Church. Then Dr. Gilkey discusses the increasing manifestations of unity and the outward goal as expressed in the intercessory prayer of Jesus, the greater unity and the Church's mission, the search for essentials, and a possible realization which many considered impossible.

Under barriers he discusses tenacity of opinion, unreasonable attachments, ultra conservatism, selfishness, sectarianism, ambition and militancy. Under impelling forces he discusses the power of truth, love and a great ideal, the sigh of the city, the call of the country, the appeal of missions, the cause of religious education, demands of economy, demands of democracy, and the spur of a great task. Under duties he discusses the confession of sin, prayer, perfecting love, community welfare, the larger loyalty and patience. He rightly regards schism as a flagrant sin, widespread, affecting the whole body of Christian believers, every denomination, every congregation and every individual member. "It is

a malaria which poisons the whole atmosphere of Church life. It is a deleterious earthly element that has found its way into all sectarian wells of salvation and has contaminated for us the very water of life. It finds its way into the supply of mental and spiritual food by which we are nourished and taints this supply with a subtle and injurious poison."

President William Allen Harper of Elon College, N. C., has given to the public his third volume—"Reconstructing the Church," an examination of the problems of the times from the standpoint of a layman of the Church (Revell, New York), with introduction by F. Marion Lawrence. President Harper's former books are "The New Church for the New Time" and "The New Layman for the New Time." This third volume is up to the standard of his former volumes. It discusses in fine spirit and able grasp many of the problems having to do with these days of reconstruction in the Church. He approaches all these subjects from the point of view of one who sees the necessity in all Christian work of a united force for the accomplishment of permanent results. In the tenth chapter he deals directly with "Christian Union—the Manner of Approaching It." First of all he says that "the denominations must avoid all discussion of their pedigree;" that is to say, the avoidance of historical discussions will help in getting together; likewise avoidance of insistence on the distinctive things for which each body stands and avoidance of reference to Christian union failures, and still another—avoidance of thoughts regarding property rights and official positions. "The hour for Christian union has come," Dr. Harper says, and "the professing Christian who wilfully and knowingly opposes its realization is a traitor to the cause of Christ."

The change of Dr. James Kent Stone from the Anglican priesthood to the Roman Catholic priesthood is an interesting story told in a volume entitled "An Awakening and What Followed" (The Ava Maria, Publisher, Notre Dame, Ind.). It is not an unkindly written book and reminds one of Dr. Kinsman's "Salve Mater." The one time president of Kenyon and Hobart Colleges, and afterwards Father Fidelis of the Cross, Passionist, has shown us how Protestant divisions looked in his eyes when he was somewhat on the Protestant side in theological controversy, but his book belongs in that classification of books which describes individual experience of persons passing from one communion to another as though it were really a conversion to Christianity. We have recently read the story of a Roman Catholic's becoming a Protestant. The author drops into the same error as Father Fidelis in putting his emphasis on religious peculiarities instead of on religion itself. One can change his views in matters of theology as radical as a Roman Catholic's becoming a Protestant or a Protestant's becoming a Roman

Catholic without its affecting his religion in any respect. In our approaches to Christian union we must come to understand that the peculiarities of any Christian communion are secondary to those universal principles common to all Christian communions.

Another interesting book of this type is "Lead Thou, the Record of a Spiritual Journey," by John Mahler (Blackwell, Publisher, Oxford, England), giving the experiences in his journey from a Quaker to an Anglican. It is told in the atmosphere of devotion. One chapter deals with the "Church and Unity" and another chapter with "Unity." The same author has published a pamphlet entitled "United Christian Fellowships" in which he affirms that there are no opportunities greater than in the field of Christian unity.

While Dr. William Sanday's last publication was in press he passed away in his seventy-seventh year. He called it his "Nunc Dimitis." It is entitled "The Position of Liberal Theology," being a friendly examination of the Bishop of Zanzibar's open letter entitled "The Christ and His Critics" (Faith Press, London). It is the argument of liberal theology against the Bishop's strictures. He interprets liberal theology as the unification of thought, which means the unification of life. He wrote in fine courtesy and knew so well how to approach those from whom he differed.

Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D., delivered two strong addresses from the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales during 1920. One is entitled "The Venture of Faith in the Making of Nations" (Congregational Union, Memorial Hall, Farringdon St., London) and the other "The Christian Church and the Social Problem" (same publisher). In the latter, regarding the Lambeth Appeal, he says, "As a Congregationalist I venture to say we welcome that appeal heartily, as we too desire that the Church of Christ should make its unity of spirit manifest to the world. We recognize with gratitude to God, Whose Spirit is leading His Church towards this goal, the advance in thought and feeling and aim of the Anglican Church towards the other great Christian Churches, and shall meet that advance with all brotherly affection. We pledge ourselves to give serious, prayerful, unprejudiced consideration to the definite proposals made, on which it would be premature to pronounce final judgment. We shall use every opportunity for fellowship and coöperation with our Anglican brethren. We pray that God by His Spirit may so guide all our counsels, as we believe He has been guiding them, that at least we and they shall be guided in the unity of the same Spirit to realize without any hindrance or limitation our common membership in the one Body of Christ, the fulfilment of Him that fulfilleth all in all to the glory of God, that God may be all in all."

In these days of so many conflicting voices on religion it is healthy

to find a book bearing the title "What is Religion?" (Macmillan). It is by Dr. Bernard Bosanquet. It is to help the believers "to get the full good, the point and spirit, of the religion which they profess." Its emphasis is on religious experience. "To be one with the supreme good in the faith that is also will—that is religion." It is the voice of the mystic and abounds in interest.

By the side of this is "Prayers for My Son: Intercessions for the use of Parents on Behalf of their Sons at School," by a Public School-master (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., London). This book is a help in the home both for the parents and the absent boys. Too much cannot be said for its regular use. There is virtue in the practice of its principles. "Purpose of Prayer," by Edward M. Bounds (Revell, New York) is another book on prayer that is refreshing. It is in the practice of prayer that the author sees the great preventative. It is the channel through which God is put in full force in the world.

Going into the depths of things as Jonathan Brierley used to do, William Ralph Inge, dean of St. Paul's, London, has said some brave things in his "Outspoken Essays" (Longmans, New York). The eleven essays of this volume will be read and reread for some time to come. He analyzes democracy with severe indictments; likewise his chapter entitled "The Indictment Against Christianity" is especially strong and thought-compelling. The Dean has a fine chapter among other contributors in "Ruskin the Prophet" (Allen and Unwin, London). The centenary of Ruskin's birth in 1919 has given us a number of books, but this one and "The Harvest of Ruskin," by J. W. Graham (Allen and Unwin, London) are among the best, especially the latter in presenting the ethical and religious teachings of Ruskin.

In the October number of *The Church Quarterly*, London, is an interesting article by the Bishop of Gloucester on "Conditional Ordination," especially dealing with Bramhall's ordinations. "The Road to Rome," by Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., is the title of an article in *The American Church Monthly*, New Brunswick, N. J., taking issue with Dr. Kinsman's argument in finding Rome his only conclusion. *The Constructive Quarterly*, New York, abounds in many fine articles in its December issue, especially "A Congregational View of the Lambeth Appeal on Christian Reunion," by Dr. A. E. Garvie, and "Reunion," by Dr. William E. Orchard.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.



"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

APRIL, 1921

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK



ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of the theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art*.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. X.

APRIL, 1921

No. 4

CONTENTS

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS CHRISTIAN REUNION . . .	249
By Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.	
THE OUTLOOK FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY	258
By Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D., Minister First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.	
TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY	269
By Rev. Alexander Ramsay, D.D., Minister Presbyterian Church of England, Highgate, London.	
THE DOGMATIC VERSUS THE EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO UNION	276
By Professor Alva W. Taylor, M.A., Professor of Social Service and Christian Missions in the Bible College of Missouri, Colum- bia, Mo.	
HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRES- ENT DAY EDUCATION?	289
By Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Balti- more, Md.	
EDITORIAL:	
THE ST. LOUIS CONFERENCE	305
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY .	309
LETTER TO THE EDITOR	317
AMONG NEW BOOKS	319

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

Pentecost Sunday has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

Annual meeting of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, Chicago, May 17-19, 1921. Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, secretary, 70 Fifth Ave., New York.

Meeting of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order at St. Stephen's College, Annadale-on-Hudson, New York, 95 miles up the Hudson, August 17-24, 1921. Robert H. Gardiner, secretary, Gardiner, Me.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

PENITENCE:

Penitence for failure to pray for those in other communions.

Penitence for thinking unkindly of another who occupies a different theological position from ourselves.

Penitence for aloofness in our relation with other Christians.

Penitence for our pride of theological interpretations.

Penitence for our selfishness.

I have acknowledged my sin to Thee, and my injustice I have not concealed. I said I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord: and Thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin.—Psa. 32:5 (Douay Version Psa. 31:5).

Have mercy on me, O God, according to Thy great mercy and according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies blot out my iniquities. Wash me yet more from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. For I know my iniquity, and my sin is always before me. To Thee only have I sinned, and have done evil before Thee: that Thou mayest be justified in Thy words, and mayest overcome when Thou art judged.—Psa. 51:1-4 (Douay Version Psa. 50:3-6).

PRAYER:

Almighty and merciful God, the Fountain of all goodness, who knowest the thoughts of our hearts, we confess unto Thee that we have sinned against Thee, and done evil in Thy sight. Wash us, we beseech Thee, from the stains of our past sins, and give us grace and power to put away all hurtful things; so that, being delivered from the bondage of sin, we may bring forth worthy fruits of repentance.

O eternal Light, shine into our hearts. O eternal Goodness, deliver us from evil. O eternal Power, be Thou our support. Eternal Wisdom, scatter the darkness of our ignorance. Eternal Pity, have mercy upon us. Grant unto us that with all our hearts, and minds, and strength, we may evermore seek Thy face; and finally bring us, in Thine infinite mercy, to Thy holy presence. So strengthen our weakness that, following in the footsteps of Thy blessed Son, we may obtain Thy mercy, and enter into Thy promised joy. Amen.—*Alcuin, A.D. 780.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL
RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMAN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church,
Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Canon of Westminster, London, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price \$2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF
THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
FOR JANUARY, 1921

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE LAMBETH APPEAL	169
BY RT. REV. ETHELBERT TALBOT, D.D., BISHOP OF BETHLEHEM.	
THE BASES OF UNITY	179
BY REV. GAIUS GLENN ATKINS, D.D., MINISTER FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, DETROIT, MICH.	
DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND ITS EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS	188
BEING THE ACTION OF THE RECENT CONVENTION OF THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.	
THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIAN PEACE	201
BEING THE ENCYCLE OF POPE BENEDICT XV.	
AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE WORLD'S WAITING AND OUR TARRYING	211
BEING ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR BY ANTHONY OPENEYE.	
EDITORIAL: FOURTH QUADRENNIAL MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL	215
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY	220
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	230
AMONG NEW BOOKS	236

A PRAYER

O LORD, forgive us for our unlovely attitudes toward each other, for we have all sinned whether we be called Protestant or Anglican, Eastern Orthodox or Roman Catholic. We have stood aloof from each other as though the other were our enemy, and have pursued our courses as though these were not in Thy House, when our ownership is in Jesus Christ, the common Lord and Saviour of us all. Teach us how to be Christian to all other Christians through Jesus Christ to Whom be glory for ever. Amen.

OVERGROWN WEEDS IN GOD'S GARDEN

AS being baptized we are all on either side brothers and sisters in Christ, we are all at bottom members of the universal Church. In this great garden of God let us shake hands with one another over the confessional hedges, and let us break them down so as to be able to embrace one another altogether. . . . Let us examine, compare and investigate the matter together, and we shall discover the precious pearl of religious peace and Church unity, and then join our hands and forces in cleansing and cultivating the garden of the Lord, which is overgrown with weeds.—*John J. I. Von Dollinger.*

IF a general in an army would divide up his forces in attacking an enemy like the Church is divided to-day in its attack on worldliness, he would be sent to the insane asylum; yet the divided Church pursues with satisfaction and pride this insane policy against a greater enemy than any general ever led an army. Is it any wonder that the world war revealed the Church without a voice to check the tragedy of war!

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS CHRISTIAN REUNION

WHAT is the motive which at the present time is making people desire, or at any rate say that they desire, unity? Is it merely a feeling that if Christianity is to be effective it must be united and strong? Is it merely the same sort of worldly motive which makes men desire to amalgamate railways and create large business combines? Because if it is so the movement has little reality or power. The only effective desire of Christian unity which will be able to break down the old established barriers that separate creeds and Churches must be religious, as intensely religious as the motives which led to separation.

Why should we desire Christian union? It is because it is only in a united Church that Christianity can be fully and completely displayed. For what does Christianity mean? It means essentially brotherhood. It means, and it has always meant, when it has been put forth in its true ideal, the breaking down of all the barriers which separate people from one another. "In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, we are all one in Christ Jesus." It is only by uniting people of different races, colours, classes, status, in one Church that this ideal can be carried out. The Christian Church from the beginning made no difference within the Christian society between the freeman and the slave and so eventually destroyed the slavery of the ancient world. The Christian Church from the beginning put the Jew and Gentile, Greek and Roman, Hellene and Barbarian on one footing and so helped in the unification of the empire. If this is the Christian ideal it is obvious how a disunited Christianity completely fails to attain it. Go to any city in England or America and you find that instead of Christianity's being the uniting principle be-

tween parties and classes it is largely the dividing principle. Go to any city in the East and you find that each race has its own particular Church and that there are no animosities greater than those between different sections of Christianity. Or pass from country to country and you find that instead of your common Christianity's being a bond of union, it is the rivalry of different Churches which helps to create international complications. A divided Christianity is inconsistent with the most fundamental principles and ideals of the Christian religion, and therefore we must seek the union of the Churches.

And then secondly, we must recognize that if we build up our Christianity on a Biblical basis the unity of Christianity is profoundly sacramental. It is based upon Baptism and the Lord's Supper. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body." "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." The meaning of Baptism is the simple initiatory rite into one society which should be as wide as humanity; the meaning of the Communion is that all good Christians, whatever their race and whatever their wealth and whatever their position, should meet together on terms of complete equality in that Feast. And no scheme of Christian reunion which does not recognize the necessity that our union must be sacramental can be successful.

What practical step can we suggest to be followed by those who desire Christian union? I think that the first thing is in every place to create that amount of fellowship which we know is possible. There is little or nothing to prevent all the Christian bodies in any one place from uniting in Christian conference. This has been done in many places; it should surely be done every-

where. The conference should be one of ministers and all representative laymen, for it is as important that the laity should be brought together as the clergy. It must be remembered that to a large extent it is in the laity that the narrowness of partizan tradition is often enshrined. In every village, therefore, in every town, in every country district, let a conference be formed representative of all the Christian religious societies. Then let that conference devote itself as far as possible in the first place to practical aims. There are many things upon which all good Christians can coöperate together. They can coöperate together on the support of hospitals and the help of the sick; they can coöperate together on arranging that full opportunities shall be given in whatever way suits the district best for religious education, even if that religious education is still to be given on different lines. They can coöperate together on many of those questions which touch the moral tone of the people. They can probably, to a large extent, coöperate together at times of great national, or even international, suffering, or in solemn services roused by a common need. The only way to do anything is to begin by doing what you can, and such a conference with common work would be possible in most parts of the world.

But that conference need not stop at this. It must be a conference also for studying on the one side the principles of the different religious bodies which keep them apart, on the other hand the ideal of the Christian Church on which they should unite. It is probable that it will be discovered that when people know one another and are able to work with one another effectively they really do not differ in the way that they think. On theological questions the old distinctions which separated one Church from another have almost vanished. On the atonement, on the incarnation, on grace and predestination, the differences are rather between different

members of the same body than between different bodies. I will not say that this is a universal truth; it is very largely so. There are few of the Calvinist Churches which are any longer really Calvinist. I do not think that left to themselves the great body of Christians would feel much difficulty in uniting so far as doctrinal questions are concerned.

But then there are the questions of Church order. How are they to be dealt with? There is a common body of opinion at the present time which suggests that all such questions can be ignored; that anyone who takes an interest in them or thinks them important or lays stress on any particular point in order may be treated with contempt and that all that we have to do is to ignore such differences. Such an attitude is exactly the sort which will do more than anything else to keep people apart. It may well be that after careful enquiry differences are found not to be so great as was thought, that some things have been looked upon as essential which were not essential, and that we might combine together without solving all these questions, but such an attitude will be attained not by contempt but by sympathy. If all the Christian Churches from the beginning have laid so much stress upon the principles of order, it is a simple fact that the two earliest documents outside the Old Testament—the Epistle of Clement and the Epistles of St. Ignatius—should both dwell largely on questions of order—if all the Christian Churches from the beginning have felt questions of order so important, that must witness to something which is real in human nature. If again they have felt that the right and due administration of the Sacraments is a matter which demands thought and reverence and has always done so, we cannot meet it by any attitude of contempt. If again a sober historian is able to point out that errors in form, order, administration, organization have often had a dis-

astrous result, surely again it bears evidence to the importance of such things.

The first thing necessary then for coming to terms on these questions of order is to approach their study with interest and sympathy. After all Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, the Papacy have all been associated at different times in history with real crises. The Medieval Papacy did great things. The English Church and its Episcopacy have been one of the great factors which have moulded the English nation. An ideal of civil liberty was associated with Congregationalism; the Presbyterianism of Calvin has reared a strong type of human nature. Do not let us treat any of these things with contempt, but let us approach together the study of them and find out elements of permanence and truth in each. I think if that was the attitude with which we approached the study of Church order it would make the solution of many problems much easier.

We have said that Christian unity in the New Testament is put before us as something sacramental, that it lies in union in Baptism and union in the Holy Communion. May I suggest a way in which I think we may advance towards union, recognizing its sacramental basis? If the Sacraments are to be a basis of union they must be celebrated with the authority of the whole Christian body. That, it will be found, underlies the principles of ordination which have always prevailed. Take, for example, Congregationalism: its unit is the congregation, and therefore in all it does authority of the congregation is paramount. Its ministers are appointed and ordained by the congregation, its Sacrament is administered in and with the authority of the congregation. Now that principle in an extended form should apply to a united Church and that is the meaning which ordination has had in an Episcopal Church. The unit of an Episcopal Church is the diocese, but that diocese is

looked upon simply as the representative in a particular place of the whole society. Wherever, therefore, a bishop is appointed over a diocese he has to be consecrated by representatives of at least three other dioceses. That is the rule which has been evolved from the custom of the bishops of all neighbouring sees coming together at consecration. So in the same way in order to keep up the unity of the diocese, whenever a presbyter is ordained representatives of the other presbyters join with the bishop in the laying on of hands. Out of these two customs has been developed the theory of the Apostolic Succession. That expresses the truth in a somewhat symbolical fashion. The real meaning of consecration and ordination is that the bishop and the priest should go forth with the authority of the whole Christian society and that its Sacraments which they administer and which are a sign of Christian unity should be administered with the authority of the whole Christian body. Now if that is the principle which really embodies the idea of consecration and ordination in historical Churches of Christendom, surely it is just the principle we are to apply if we attempt in any way Christian reunion. To say simply our Sacraments are the Sacraments of the Christian Church is not enough; it may be the first step, but it is not enough. What we have to do is to show that we are united in them. That means that every minister should have the authority of the whole body. Now surely the way to bring that about is wherever possible to summon those who are representatives of other Christian bodies to take part in each ordination. Let that be done in a simple and straightforward way without attempting to lay down terms of reunion or anything of that sort. Why when a minister is to be appointed to any congregation in a Christian town should not representatives of all the other religious bodies be asked to attend and assist in the laying on of hands? If

that were done union in the Communion in the future would not be any violation of principles; it would mean that the newly appointed minister of whatever body he was had received a commission from all the other bodies; it would mean that people were united together and the adjustments of organization in the future would be comparatively easy. It is, I believe, by a union in ordination that Christian reunion can be best brought about.

A feeling that very naturally arises about Christian unity is the hopelessness of it. People look at the Christian world as it is at present and see it divided into an innumerable number of religious sects, and they also look at human nature and see the constant tendency that there is to controversy, to disagreement and to more serious forms of quarrelling, and they wonder whether any change in this can take place. How can we get a state of mind which will not only prevent new divisions but which will do away with the old? I venture to think that the fundamental necessity is to get a real determination for unity, and that that should continuously work on people's minds.

Let us consider what has been happening for the last three hundred years ever since the Reformation. The desire for unity was for long much in abeyance. There have been even theories of the Church which have rejected any form of visible Christian unity. A large part of the Christian world has found its unity in a doctrine of the invisible Church. People have not desired to be one. Their attention has been turned to particular aspects of the Christian message. All their force and interest have been concentrated on those. The consequence has been naturally that there has been no desire for unity and so unity has not been attained. But supposing the contrary spirit was to prevail; supposing that the new feeling of brotherhood, of fellowship—the new conceptions which

are very widespread, which would like to break down the barrier of race and nation and language—supposing that these really got a hold of people's minds simply as theoretical doctrines, that they are taught in Church, that they are taught in schools, that they are taught in the public press and become part of what I may call the commonplace, not only of Christian teaching but of secular teaching. For a time it may seem difficult to carry them into effect, but the continuous influence of teaching like this on people's minds will ultimately be very powerful. There are many things which, say, two hundred years ago were never thought of which are now almost commonplace. Take the idea of the full representation of each man as a citizen that is now almost looked upon as a commonplace. There is hardly a country in the world which has not representation in some form or other. The political system created has now many defects, but it does mean fundamentally that every man is recognized as having his rights. Now the whole of the doctrine on which this is based is something very novel. Think of the constitution of France in 1780 and think of the constitution of France in 1880—what a tremendous transformation of ideas has taken place. Now if that sort of change can work so rapidly why should not it work equally rapidly in regard to Christianity and the union of the Christian Church? The first steps will necessarily be slow and tentative. For a considerable time little definite progress will probably be made, but ultimately it will be found that people's aspect has changed and unity will come with great rapidity.

Our primary duties then are twofold: the first is to teach Christian unity not as a mere matter of arrangement or convenience or for administrative purposes, but as a fundamental Christian idea, the idea of brotherhood, of fellowship, and the union of all men in Christ; and the

second duty of the Christian Church is to pray for this union. What becomes part of the sincere and genuine prayers of the Christian world will very soon become part of the practical policy and will obtain its consummation in life.

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM.

Christ Church,
Oxford, England.

HUMANITY

WHAT care I for cast or creed?
It is the deed, it is the deed.
What for class, or what for clan?
It is the man, it is the man!
It is of love and joy and woe,
For who is high and who is low,
Mountain, valley, sky and sea
Are for all humanity.

What care I for robe or stole?
It is the soul, it is the soul.
What for the crown or what for chest?
It is the soul within the breast,
It is the faith, it is the hope,
It is the struggle up the slope,
It is the brain and the eye to see
One God and one humanity.

—ROBERT LOVEMAN.

THE TASK

It takes great strength to live where you belong
When other people think that you are wrong;
People you love, and who love you, and whose
Approval is a pleasure you would choose.
To bear this pressure and succeed at length
In living your belief—well, it takes strength.

—CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN.

THE OUTLOOK FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

ARE the Churches of America making any real progress toward Christian unity? This question meets one to-day on every hand. Even men of the world, and not merely God's children who have been praying and working and sacrificing for it for a generation, are asking it, sometimes anxiously, sometimes skeptically.

Let us take a good searching look at the present situation.

Widest, and greatest of all in many ways, is the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order, the preliminary conference for which recently met at Geneva. Invitations to the conference itself have been accepted by practically every Christian body of national proportions in the world, with the exception of the Roman Catholic.

Nobody expects this conference to agree on a statement of Christian faith, and it would be an unexpected marvel if the different bodies should agree to recognize each others' orders, but here is an indication of the world-wide moving of God's Spirit that has limitless possibilities, the like of which has not been seen since the jealousies of the Eastern and Western episcopates first split the Christian Church.

Next in importance to us in the United States is the "Plan of Union" for the Protestant Evangelical Churches of our country, sent down to the different denominations by the conference at Philadelphia, December, 1919. This was called by the invitation of the Presbyterian General Assembly at Columbus, Ohio. The "Plan of Union" proposed was unanimously accepted by the recent Assembly at Philadelphia and sent down to the Presbyteries. It must have the approval of two-thirds of these, which it seems likely to get. The Plan has already been approved by the Methodist General Conference, and can be put into effect as soon as it is approved by six of

the nearly twenty denominations whose representatives approved it in Philadelphia.

There are also encouraging movements on foot to unite the Presbyterian and Reformed bodies into one General Assembly, and to bring into one Conference the northern and southern Methodists.

Other movements, like the union of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists and Northern Presbyterians have been effected, while yet others are merely being urged.

But underlying all these, and giving impetus to them are the unions, ever increasing in number, of congregations that overlap each other in the same community. These are effected in different ways, but they are taking place every day, and denominational opposition to them is either decreasing or, in a few cases, being ignored.

But what about the break-down of the Interchurch Movement? Isn't that clear proof that, while Christian people may boost Church unity and boast of denominational readiness to make sacrifices for it, when the Church leaders attempt some practical expression of it, we meet with failure?

It would lead too far afield to discuss the up and down of the Interchurch Movement, but let this be said, that even the Church leaders who most ardently advocated it, recognize to-day that the success of the Interchurch Movement, as it was organized and carried forward, would have been a greater calamity than its break-down.

As it is, the aims and ideals of denominational coöperation which led us into the Interchurch Movement are not to be allowed to perish. The recent quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, held in Boston, the greatest gathering of its kind, without doubt, that our nation has ever seen, sent down to the denominations a plan for enlarging its powers, making the Council an arm of these denominations to do things, as well as a mind to investigate and advise.

The hearty unanimity with which this plan of Dr. Robert E. Speer's committee was adopted cheers us to hope that the thirty denominations of the Council will soon find a way to do our great and common tasks unitedly.

These things, and more on which we might dwell, indicate that as never before the hearts of Christ's people are being stirred to answer His prayer for our unity. But we must be patient and prayerful, and where essentials are not involved, sacrificial. And we must be very careful not to blunder into seeking unity in a wrong way or along the wrong lines.

It is a vast step forward that we have come to distinguish between unity and uniformity, that denominationism is not a blunder, but a providence, not the fruit of schismatics, but the protest of conscience, and that we may make of our denominationalism not the paralysis, but the enrichment of the spiritual life of Christ's Church.

We must not blunder into an attempt to condition Christian unity on identity of creedal statement, even about the essentials of evangelical Christianity. There must be common acceptance of these great truths—our conception of God, of Jesus Christ our Divine Lord and Redeemer and “His atoning sacrifice,” the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the necessity not only of the new birth but of a life of love and good works, the bodily resurrection of our Lord and His believers, the final awards of eternity—but this is a very different thing from saying that agreement on a creedal statement concerning these great truths must be the first step in Christian unity. If we do demand that, rest assured Christian unity will not come till we no longer see “through a glass darkly,” but “see as we are seen and know as we are known” by our omniscient Lord.

Neither should we condition our unity on mutual recognition of our ecclesiastical orders. For a certain cour-

tesy's sake, this may appear to some essential. But we ministers of one denomination may find a real unity with brethren the canon laws of whose denomination lag behind their own Christian brotherliness. Christ did that when He told the disciples, "Forbid them not; for he that is not against us is on our part." The fact is, there is beautiful and effective coöperative activity in many of our union movements without any emphasis on this tender point.

Let us not blunder here through either pride or contention. We do not have to wait for the success of world conferences on faith and order to give expression to our Christian unity. Experience must show us that it cannot come through compulsion, for men who have learned to think God's thoughts after Him for themselves will not take man-made dictations from any source. It was this attempt which produced the division of Protestantism. We may rest assured it will not heal them.

Nor will it come by argument. A man's philosophy usually determines his type of theology; and his theology determines his exegesis. Argument over these things has led us to stress non-essentials, to justify our divisions.

Much less ought we to seek it through compromise. This would impoverish the Church beyond expression, and make both creed and ritual a thing of "minimums," as one writer has well put it, instead of "maximums."

We must go after unity along the pathway of comprehension. "What have you," we must say to each denomination, "that will enrich the spiritual life of the Church?" Bring it in, and let it be our common possession. All of us have been interpreting Christ and Christian experience from some particular point of view. No one of us has got a complete vision from every angle. Let us post our products, and maybe we shall find, with-

out our having realized it that God has given not to any one, but to all of us united the full vision of the circle.

In short Christian unity is going forward because we are learning more and more to magnify Christ instead of the creeds we frame concerning Him and the rituals through which we worship Him. There is only one path along which we can advance and that is coöperative activity, and a common Christian experience. Thirty of our great denominations have been learning to coöperate in investigating conditions and advising what should be done to meet them. It looks as if we were now ready to coöperate in the activities which we have counseled. We can work together, if we will be patient, and substitute Christian confidence and brotherly esteem for denominational rivalry and suspicion. And after all, this was Christ's great test: not creed, nor ritual, nor even mutual recognition of ecclesiastical dignities, but conduct. "Ye are my disciples if ye do whatsoever I command you." We proved to ourselves and the world that we could work together by our united welfare work during the late war. It had its frictions, but so must it be with all constructive work of wide activity; but we got it done, because we all took a hand in it, and we were all drawn to it by a common devotion.

Let us consider then, some of the constraints that impel us to unite in carrying forward our Lord's great enterprises for world conquest.

First of all, there is our common agreement on the great essentials of Christian faith and conduct. We cherish a common belief on the great essentials of evangelical religion, though we have not yet reached the point where we can agree on the verbal statements which define them. Of far more importance, we cherish the same ideals as to what constitutes a Christian life and character, and its supreme value in our social organism here as well as to heavenly citizenship hereafter.

Then we have the fact that during recent years our forms of polity have been approaching each other. In-

dividual congregations of the congregational type have been seeking larger group relations while prelatical types have been giving larger place to the laity. Not only has the episcopal polity, both Protestant and Methodist, been giving a legislative voice to the laity, and congregationalists laying larger emphasis on the value of their councils, but even the Presbyterians, *mirabile dictu*, are beginning to wonder if the bishop may not have divine values if not divine authority. With all of us there is much less of the bigoted insistence on the divine character of our particular form of government and a growing conviction that human needs of different historical periods have had a great deal to do with determining polities in the Church's past; and that each of these polities may have something of real value to contribute to what is to be the Church's form of government in the future.

On every hand, also, we meet a cheering readiness on the part of the laity to try out any promising forms of coöperative activity, and a growing eagerness for Church unity. In fact, it looks as if in many places the laity are so eager for it, that if ecclesiastical hostility persists in blocking it or even in long deferring it, they will rise up and break down the barriers themselves.

The present day conditions resulting from denominational rivalry are rapidly becoming unbearable. The old cry of, "If we don't hurry up and plant a Church there, the Methodists or Baptists will get ahead of us," no longer gets dollars from consecrated Christian laymen, but disgusts. Eagerness to get ahead of another denomination is, let us thank God, giving way to eagerness to coöperate with another denomination, that by united effort we may get ahead of the world, the flesh and the devil.

The cause of Christ does not have to stagnate in small towns and rural sections because the people of Christ are called on to maintain a half dozen anæmic, little Churches

there, and keep out of the country almshouse a pastor for each, when all of them might unite and make one great, strong Church, headed by a man of such force, as well as piety, that he stands out as one of the great men of the community, and gathering about it, with a mighty vitality, the intellectual and social and literary, as well as the spiritual life, of the entire community.

It is not right to lay upon a little community of fifteen hundred to two thousand people the financial burden of supporting five or six pastors and keeping as many Church organizations going, where one or two could more effectively serve their spiritual needs. Ice cream suppers and strawberry festivals and working the unconverted merchants of the community for contributions to donation parties, with the added indignity put on them of missionary boxes of old clothes to their pastors, serve to characterize such denominational zeal, more than the conversion of the unsaved.

Another great hindrance to the cause of Christ has been the inability of Protestantism to deliver a united blow on the great battles of our day. We had to create a special organization to fight the saloon; and we never dealt its death-blow till we dealt it unitedly. We had to resort to the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. to do our welfare work during the war. To-day we face what is in many ways the most crucial year of our generation. Shall we let the world slip back into its old ways of stanching immorality and self indulgence? Shall we let victory by physical force spell moral defeat and spiritual decline? Especially shall we let a generation that has fattened beyond dreams on the famine and poverty and strife of war-smitten Europe and Asia yield to the base motives of greed and self-indulgence and love of ease, and after glutting themselves like a great herd of fattened swine lie down in the sun? Or shall we still prod conscience with the parable of the rich fool, and call men and women

to the more difficult career of peacetime heroism, and the Christ-like ministries of sacrificial service, our only escape from the "Ichabod" which Providence writes over a once-time hero as he sinks, like a fatted fool, into the easy chair of luxury?

Such a task as this can be done only by a Church united, as well as a Church impassioned.

Let us think also of the great number of really heroic men and women whose services have been alienated from the Church by our denominational divisions and consequent waste of energy and sectarian strife over minor matters. They are to be found in every community. They must be appealed to with something big and heroic. Many of them were leaders, sacrificial toilers, in war welfare work. Can we not put up a programme in peacetime which will make as heroic an appeal to their passion for righteousness and the moral welfare of humanity, as war-time work made to their patriotism?

That depends, too, in a most vital way, on a united Church. It is a pitifully pathetic appeal which the parish work of our overchurched villages and towns is able to make to-day, either to young men of big heroic mould to become pastors, or to laymen and women of like type to sacrifice themselves in its activities. But unite these Churches, merge them into one great spiritual force, whose mighty momentum gathers up every phase of welfare and uplift for that community, and where is there a man who loves God and has the good of men at heart to whom its call will not appeal?

In view of these things, and much more that could be said, one great question is crowding in on the consciousness of Christ's people to-day. How can I help unite the forces of Christ and lend a hand in unifying their mobilization into one mighty army? How can we help on this greatest movement for world conquest since apostolic days?

First of all by a fine loyalty to Jesus Christ in thought and deed and to that particular branch of His Church through which we have enlisted as His followers, and in whose worship and work we can express our best endeavor for God. Lack of loyalty to any particular denomination or even congregation means disloyalty to Christ and uselessness in His service. If we are not meeting a Christian's task by loyal devotion to the work of our own particular congregation and denomination, we are an incubus on the army.

These people who talk of being such broad-minded, liberal Christians that they feel kindly toward all Churches, and belong to none, are giving an excuse for not doing their duty, and the excuse is their reproach. It is of no value in a cause to feel kindly toward it. That lets a man drown while you sing a lullaby to him from the land. You must lend a hand; and, in this task, till the hand grows horny in the service.

Then it will help the cause on wonderfully if we learn increasingly to emphasize, not minor matters, but the essentials of faith and conduct. We like worship conducted in a certain way, and it gives us confidence in the preacher's orthodoxy when certain theological shibboleths are often on his lips; but forms and ceremonies are forgotten in the great crises of life. Simplicity of worship and creed expressions, and a great brotherliness in our attitude toward all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, will compose many differences and help us into the loving unity of one family in Christ in a wonderful way.

Then every one of us can take an active part to help along every movement toward Christian unity. These are going forward to-day in every community. Sectarian prejudice will make you hold aloof, and brand them as foolish emotionalism or disloyal liberalism. Let sectarian prejudice die. It has done enough damage. Encour-

age your pastor or rector to exchange pulpits with the pastors of other denominations. Go to another Church now and then yourself and get acquainted with its pastor and people. Encourage Church federations and support attempts of denominational leaders to do things together. Scores of things that long defied isolated effort will come easily if you attempt them unitedly. For after all, real Christian unity waits, not on the deliberations of ecclesiastics. Their arguments are interminable and their often inconsequential objections have no end. It waits on a great ground-swell from a long-suffering laity who know from fellowship in Christian activities, and by sharing a common Christian experience, that they should not be divided by outgrown denominational barriers, but united as brothers by "the tie that binds our hearts in Christian love," and have learned to pray, "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

Last spring in the beautiful little Presbyterian Church at Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, I heard Robert Freeman, of Pasadena, California, preach a wonderful sermon, and at the close of it he told this little story. It was about a meeting when the strapping, big-bodied Ira Shaw and stocky young Roosevelt were introduced to each other.

"You look as if you were an athlete," Roosevelt said as his eye travelled up Shaw's big body.

"Yes, I've played foot-ball a little," he answered.

"Where were you?"

"At Yale."

"Why you must be the Shaw on whose back Harold Wickes made his wonderful games."

"Yes," answered the big fellow, "The scars of Harold Wickes' cleats are still all over my back."

The divisions of Christendom have made many scars on the body of Christ.

Let us get forward by them to our great goal, that our Lord's prayer, that we all may be one, may soon be answered, and with it a world convinced that He came forth from God and can lead a lost world back to God.

JOSEPH A. VANCE.

First Presbyterian Church,
Detroit, Mich.

CHRIST'S CHURCH

CREEDS and confessions? High Church or the Low?

I cannot say; but you would vastly please us
If with some pointed Scripture you could show
To which of these belonged the Saviour, Jesus.
I think to all, or none. Not curious creeds
Or ordered forms of churchly rule be taught
But soul of love that blossomed into deeds,
With human good and human blessing fraught.
On me nor priest nor presbyter nor pope;
Bishop nor dean, may stamp a party name;
But Jesus, with his largely human scope,
The service of my human life may claim.
Let prideful priests do battle about creeds,
The church is mine that does most Christ-like deeds.

—JOHN STUART BLACKIE.

MY CREED

THE finest thing beneath the sun
Is brave, right living;
Duty done at stroke of hour,
Kind thoughts bestowed,
A life to ease a brother's load,
Temptation overcome;
Some cause pushed forward—
And then a restful pause
To let the uprising good
In our own hearts find its little rood
In which to grow.

—AMY DAVIS WINSHIP.

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY

THERE is no movement within Christendom so marked and all-dominating in our day as the movement towards unity. It has captured the hearts of Christian men; even where it is deemed unattainable, it is yet longed for. The evidence of its force and vitality is seen on every side. On the mission field it has produced a recognition of spheres of effort not unlike the assignment of the "circumcision" and the "uncircumcision" to the original apostles and to St. Paul. There is a determination not to transplant the divisions and sects of the older world among the infant Churches springing up in heathen lands. Hence the arrangements in Africa for intercommunion and open fellowship, and the merging in China and Japan and India of the converts of missionaries from different communions into one united Church, that is called by the name of Christ, and knows nothing of the Congregationalism or Presbyterianism or Wesleyanism whence came the Gospel to them. In South India the time is ripe for the uprising of a Church, in the unity of which are to be embraced the missions of all sections of the Reformed Church. In view of the future and of the growth of a native Christianity, and in face of the call and need of the heathen world, any other alternative than that of union stands self-condemned, and it is full of hope that impulse towards it often springs from the native Christians themselves.

But the same phenomenon is seen in lands of ancient Christian traditions, with differences and distinctions and separations among Christians that have their roots deep in the past of historic controversies and old contentings for the faith. In Scotland the two Presbyterian Churches which include in their membership probably ninety per cent of the Church-going population, are about to come together. In England the divided sons of the Wesleyan revival are considering the terms of an

incorporating union. In Canada negotiations for the union of the Presbyterian and Wesleyan Churches are far advanced. In the new Republic of Czecho-Slovakia the scattered sections of the evangelical Churches have been drawn together in one united Church. In America denominational distinctions have worn thin, and lines of demarcation are all but invisible, while the federation of the Churches of Christ for common service is an accomplished fact and "community" services, in which all unite for common worship, abound. There is no land in which the faith of Christ is alive, where this tendency to union may not be seen. Churches that call Jesus Lord are discovering their kinship, and their relation and attitude to each other is sweetened and Christianized. Churches of a common polity or of common ecclesiastical and doctrinal affinities are coming together into one fold. The meeting at Geneva last August brought together by the initiative of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, to consider questions of faith and order for the healing of the broken fellowship of the catholic Church, was in its comprehensiveness the most remarkable assembly the world has seen since the Reformation. The presence of representatives of the Orthodox Church of the East lent it unique distinction. Save for the regretted and lamentable refusal of the Roman Church to take part, it had a title to be called ecumenical. The official attitude of that Church bars and padlocks the door against any approach to fellowship save on the terms of absorption and submission to the papal claims, and until a better mind is born within her the movement towards reunion can only operate in the Christian Church outside of her communion, and it has its most unrestricted field among those who rejoice in the heritage of the Reformed faith. The appeal of the bishops of the Anglican Communion on this urgent question of "the reunion of the separated congregations of Christ's flock," issued also in

August of last year, has awakened a sympathetic response in myriads of Christian hearts. It is indeed no less than a momentous deliverance. All recognize that it is animated and inspired by the spirit of Christ. It is His voice that speaks therein; and an obligation, from which without wilful disobedience there is no escape, is laid on all who "profess and call themselves Christians" to consider afresh and seriously those things which make for the restoration and healing of the broken fellowship of the Church of Christ, which is His body.

It is these signs, appearing in every quarter of the globe, and in widely separated sections of the Church that are the outward and visible tokens of the presence and guidance of the Spirit of God. It is a divinely inspired tendency with which we are face to face. The devout conviction may well be ours that this thing is not of man but of God. As in the earliest days it was the risen Lord who guided His people in the teeth of their prejudices and prepossessions to go forth to the evangelising of the heathen world, so now it is under the same divine leadership, over the obstacle of our predilections and preferences, we seek the gathering into one of the scattered tribes of the one Israel of God. In this sacred task He leads and we but follow. For His will is that all who believe in Him be "one" and the urgency of this lay in the world's salvation. The unity was in order that the "world may believe," and this is proof that it was a unity, outward and manifest, visible to the dull eyes of the natural man that discerns not spiritual things. It is not enough to possess an underlying unity and inward fellowship such as may be known only to God and of which true Christians may be conscious. That is indeed the vital thing, the source of what appears in time: but it is the body, of which this is the soul that the "world" alone can see and the sight of which is to give to men the conviction that they are in presence of a supernatural fact. What a caricature and travesty of this

heavenly vision is that broken and divided Church, indulging in rivalry, forgetful of brotherhood, unwilling to unite even at the Table of our common Lord in the communion of His body and blood, which is the only aspect of the one redeemed society, that is presented to men's eyes! Our minds have been opened to the shame of it. The sin of schism offends to-day the Christian conscience. The prayer that we may lay to heart "the evil of our unhappy divisions" is being widely answered in our day. With our disunion and secessions and separations, loyalty to conscience and suffering for the truth's sake have been bound up: but in spite of much that was noble and heroic and seemingly inevitable in the renouncing of the common fellowship and the organizing of separated groups, there was at the core of it, on one side or the other and probably on both, something gravely wrong. We fought for truth and forgot charity. We allowed self-will to have its way and heeded not the bond of brotherhood. Our "testimony" became a challenge and defiance and not a speaking of the truth in love. It is vain to attempt to apportion blame. It is only well to unite in mutual penitence before God for the sins which have brought to pass the sad state of affairs that has all too long persisted. For beyond controversy this is clean contrary to the mind of Christ. These divisions mar and maim the Church's efficiency. They provoke rivalry instead of coöperation. All Christians need all other Christians. It is only with "all saints" we can comprehend the height and depth, the length and breadth of the love of Christ. Great discoveries and great attainments lie along the way of a corporate experience. It was concern for the world's salvation that throbbed in the heart of the world's Saviour when He prayed for His Church's unity, and it is a like concern that moves His disciples to-day to labour and pray for the same consummation. The supreme missionary task

of the Church demands not only for its accomplishment but even for its adequate undertaking, the service of an undivided Church. This mood and mind, here sketched, is in its widespread possession a new thing among Christians. It implies a revolution in traditional modes of thought and outlook. It is the product of the inspiration of the Spirit of God. It is under the spell thereof that plans and actions must be determined and all proposals considered. If any do not passionately desire the unity of Christ's Church and its visible manifestation and are not distressed by the lack thereof, let such stand aside from all intermeddling with this sacred business.

What is the end we have in view? It is here we need to make clear to ourselves the goal we aim at. Is it to be a federation of Churches in which things remain much as they are, save that the mutual relations have become more intimate and cordial and there is the fullest and freest recognition of each other's Sacraments and ministries, with interfellowship and intercommunion and co-operation for common ends? Or is it to be a reunited Church—"an outward, visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers using God-given means of grace and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God? This is the consummation the Anglican bishops wish to promote by the Lambeth Appeal, and these are the terms in which they describe the catholic Church. Now it is to be admitted that among Protestants, men of good-will who care seriously for unity, this latter aim is by no means universally thought to be desirable, even if practicable. They detest monopolies; they fear the stagnation of one vast organization, which has not the stimulus of dissent from it or the friendly rivalry in good works of various groups of Christians. They dread still more the development of wide and persecuting tendencies in one great Church, none the less evil and cruel because working by social ostracism and ecclesiastical disfavour and

censure, and not by the old weapons of the rack and the thumb-screw and the faggot and the prison. The memory of the age-long experiment of the Church of Rome is not a happy one and has left an inveterate bias against its repetition. It was not well with religion in Europe when there was only one Church in all Western Europe. They do not want to go behind the Reformation and reproduce the state of things which the Reformation brought to an end to the world's unspeakable gain, even if loss and risk accompanied the change. It is common ground that unity does not involve uniformity, and the catholic Church of our vision and hopes is not in any sense a restoration of the Roman Church of the Middle Ages or even of to-day. The unity we seek ought to be comprehensive enough to embrace within it the treasures of spiritual experience and faith and order, possessed now only by the separated communions, and to leave room for diversified and distinctive methods of worship and service such as have proved channels of grace in the many communions to which Christians at present belong. For the manifested unity of the Church what are needed are a common faith, common Sacraments and a common ministry, universally recognized and accepted in all the branches, national, racial, temperamental, of the one fellowship. Were these possessed, membership in any one section would be seen beyond challenge to be membership in the Church Universal, and the dividing barriers would inevitably disappear. Differences would remain but walls of partition would everywhere be levelled to the ground. It is on these essentials and not on any detail of organization that thought ought to be concentrated. It is not too much to say that those who think that federation between diverse communions is sufficient have not thought out the case. That indeed is a stage on the way to the ultimate goal but it cannot be more than a stage. It is in the nature of things transitional. Sectarianism belongs to a past generation. Denominational loyalty can be less and

less counted on as a vital and binding force. The convictions that called denominations into being and maintained them in efficiency and were their reasons for being have lost hold. The common faith of all Christians counts for more, while the sectional faith of any Christian counts for little in the modern believing world. Inevitably federation of denominations will change these powerful tendencies, operative on all sides, into a mighty rushing torrent that will sweep away these distinctions. Federation in the nature of the case cannot do other than act as a solvent to denominationalism. It will be insistently asked, Why not merge? Why maintain costly separate organizations at the waste of money and effort and efficiency? In Canada the negotiations for union between Presbyterianism and Wesleyanism have dragged on for years, owing mainly to the interruption of the war, and the result is that nearly one hundred congregations have already sprung up that have for themselves practically solved the question of union and owe no allegiance to conference or synod. This is the straw that shows the drift. Those who reckon federation as the goal of their striving reckon without their host. As soon as it is reached, it is seen to be a stage on the way to a goal far beyond it. Let us then keep before us the vision of a united Church whose union is obvious to all. It is to this the great King and Head of the Church calls us. Let us labour for this. Let us pray unceasingly for its attainment. Let us welcome every approach towards it. Let us freely and fully recognize the place and part in the one household of faith, of all who call Jesus Lord. This great and historic day, in which our lot is cast, has made the way towards Christian unity as a broad and open thoroughfare in which all who love the Lord and discern His will for our day will be found.

ALEXANDER RAMSAY.

Presbyterian Church of England,
Highgate, London.

THE DOGMATIC VERSUS THE EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO UNION

EVER since the Church was divided there have been advocates of Christian union. The tides of movement, however, have hitherto been towards disunion. The disintegration of monarchical and centralized authority and the attainment of democracy made for independence and a strong individualism. The changes in both polity and creed have been toward a disintegration of centralization. The unity of the ONE CHURCH of medievalism was based upon authority. In polity it was the creed of an infallible papal curia and in creed it was the logic of scholasticism. Neither permitted freedom of intellect or of organization, and both based fellowship upon the implicit acceptance of a stated set of beliefs. The movement for democracy in religion thus became a protest for personal freedom in both.

The break, or the series of breaks, was not however so much with the conception that a creedal agreement must be the basis of fellowship as with the established creeds as that basis. Thus Luther broke with Rome, but flamed against Zwingli for not agreeing with him. The Puritans fled England to obtain freedom to worship according to their conscience, but denied the same fundamental right to Baptists and Quakers. The Baptists for centuries braved persecutions to obtain liberty of assembly but would not tolerate the Campbells when they introduced innovations in creed.

The days of violent intolerance are past in all democratic lands but the day of creedal tolerance has arrived in few of those segments of the Church into which the movement toward toleration split it. We are not yet willing to tolerate any large differences in creed or polity, or at least we are not willing to surrender much of the historic or traditional of the various denominations or those peculiar demarcations of fellowship wrought

out in the original segmentation. The basis of fellowship has not changed from the fundamentals of medieval demand for conformity in creed and polity; the form of the polity has been democratized and the content of the creed has been modified in the various protesting schisms but the basis of fellowship still remains fundamentally where it was.

It has always been maintained that there is only one Gospel but there have always been varying interpretations. So long as we confuse interpretations of the Gospel with the ONE GOSPEL and continue to make the basis of fellowship a creedal agreement as to what the Gospel teaches we shall have divisions in the Church. No large body of men would fellowship on the basis of the ten commandments even if the continuance of the fellowship depended upon exact agreement in interpretation and application. We shall never agree on all matters of interpretation unless all but one of us agrees to quit thinking and to humbly accept the reason of one infallible interpreter. The evolution of the medieval idea of union led logically to the dogma of papal infallibility. The Roman Catholics have one horn of the dilemma in papal infallibility and the Plymouth Brethren the other in the endless segmentation of believers in order that none may come into a fellowship unless there is utter peace and no differences of opinion. The one destroys democracy in a monarchical centralization and the other in a vapid decentralization.

So long as fellowship is based upon any authoritative creed embodying more than a simple acceptance of Jesus as *the* Christ and Saviour we shall have division. The confession of Peter (Matthew 16:16)¹ and that Apostle's declaration in the sermon on Pentecost Day (Acts 2:36)² are the minimum upon which a CHRISTIAN union could

¹"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

²"God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus Whom ye crucified."

be based. Less than that might be religious unity but as we are considering Christian union the minimum would imply an acceptance of Jesus as the Christ. On that all interested in Christian union agree. In demanding more than that come all divisions. On that basis all now can meet in common prayer and by that line of demarcation do both the world and all other religious cults know who makes up the universal Christian Church. That which the Gospel makes the only basis of fellowship we have made merely the minimum on which we will agree, as against all the non-Christian world, to call one another Christians. On that basis we would do battle if necessary, against a concerted attack of Islam or atheism, but on that basis we will not agree to prosecute the Lord's conquest of either Islam or atheism, or coöperate and be one that the world might believe He was sent (Jno. 17:21).³

If all loyalties were rational and if every disciple of Jesus could think things through for himself the proposal to unite all His followers on the simple confession of Him as *the* Christ, the Son of God, would be feasible. But we have to deal with the simple fact that we are creatures of tradition and habitual ideas and tend to segregate ourselves into group fellowships as iron particles separate themselves about magnates. In apostolic days the fellowship was simple. No diverting and differentiating creedal opinions had arisen to divide. The men who had been with Jesus accepted Him as Christ and Lord and went about persuading others to do so. The fellowship was limited, at first, to local congregations and largely of Jewish nationality. No sooner did it cross the racial lines or develop great commanding advocates, like Paul, than differences arose that threatened divisions in the fellowship. Paul and Peter saved themselves from a break by Peter's yielding to the interpretation of the

³"That they may all be one * * * * that the world may believe that thou didst send me."

greater Apostle, but not all consented to follow him and we find the "Judaizers" crossing his path constantly. The Council of Jerusalem adopted sensible compromise to save friction or a possible eruption and everywhere the human nature that will disagree in opinions and interpretations obtruded itself. What those near Jesus and under the powerful apostleship of a Paul could circumvent could not be done after he was gone and the Church crossed Grecian boundaries where thinking was a fine art and philosophy tithed the mint and anise of dialectic and syllogism. A millennium and a half of Christian history then becomes the story of heresy followed by scholastic thinking, monarchical authority and the submergence of the free mind in institutionalism.

The problem before us now is that of whether or not we are enough emancipated from the need of an external authoritarianism to hold us to any kind of a loyalty. Will our faith and loyalty be alive and vigorous unless it is fixed on a more or less hard and fast dogma? Combat troops have to be narrowed to a single idea; it is not theirs to reason why; it is theirs to do and die. The average man seems to require a fairly well fixed and unquestioned creed for lively action. Whether in patriotism or class conscious evolution or in religion he seems to require a notion that others are wrong in order to be assured that he and his are unquestionably right, and without that unquestionable ground beneath his feet he does not run and do battle. He builds his creedal walls quite as much to keep out his fellow man as he does to shelter his fellow believers.

A survey of denominational growth points to the conclusion that there is a median line of authoritarianism in creed and polity along which numerical success crowns denominational banners. Presbyterianism has age and tradition, an historic creed, a polity that harmonizes the democratic concept with successful administration, and

that sense of respectability which is so powerful in effecting social groupings. It combines in a very effective way all those concepts and controls to which the average democratic mind of the better grade reacts. The Baptists bring a simple dogma, founded upon a quotable Scripture, and give it dramatic dress in ordinances that demark the line of correct and incorrect in an unmistakable manner. Their polity tends to dogmatize independence and the dogma of it is perhaps more stimulating than the independence. Methodism submits a different test, but one that answers quite as well the mental quest of assurance, in a personal, inner experience that is unmistakable and in an authoritarian polity that bends to democratic prepossessions without losing its administrative capacity. These three greatest of our American Protestant bodies, all having a history older than the Republic, have each been divided into many segments as a result of the play of democratic independence against authoritarian creeds and polities. The last Year Book of the Churches lists twenty-nine Baptists and Brethren (all Baptist) bodies, seventeen Methodist and fourteen Presbyterian and Reformed (all Presbyteria). But outside the sectional lines arising out of the Civil War numerical preponderance lies with the historic main bodies. The creedal subdivisions have not been effective in winning numbers. All the psychological requirements of assurance and the sense of authority were supplied by the main historic bodies; the efforts to rationalize away from them has not gone far in creating large new denominations.

It would seem that the divisive trends, founded upon the protest of the democratic right to independence of mind and conscience, were fairly well rounded out in the driving of the main cleavages. Now that the right of independent thinking and association is established we tend to rest back upon the more conservative assurances of

tradition. The overwhelming mass of Christians in the nearly two hundred Protestant sects are in the historic old denominational families, and within those families the overwhelming majorities are within the original denominational body. The trend toward division is dissipating but there is no real ground as yet to hope that the rock foundations of the main divisions are crumbling. The sense of social solidarity and the larger tolerance in creedal refinements is tending to draw the denominational families together and the removal of the pressure of persecution and denunciation makes it ever more difficult to grow large dissenting bodies. We are perhaps about at the end of the process of segmentation simply because we are making the bands of fellowship more elastic, but we are not yet out of the grip of tradition and of denominational loyalties as a social inheritance into which we are born and bred or into which we are adopted by some adventitious circumstances.

A further proof of the virility of dogma as over against a nondogmatic type of basis for fellowship is given in a comparison of the growth of various communions in the past century in America. The Unitarians offer almost perfect creedal freedom, but few seem to have desired it. The Congregationalists, aside from their democratic polity, admit to membership practically upon the basis of the simple confession of Jesus as The Christ, but they have grown only by thousands where the more dogmatic denominations have grown by the hundreds of thousands. The Southern Baptists, who are perhaps firmest in their dogmas and most fervent over them, are growing more rapidly than are the Northern Baptists. The Disciples have multiplied beyond all others in the century of their history. Their present static condition is only apparent—a book loss rather than a real loss—as a result of substituting a real statistical accounting in the place of guess work.

The Disciples furnish striking illustration of the thesis of this paper. They had their beginnings in the naïve effort of a Presbyterian seceder to gather all the Christians of a scattered pioneer community into a fellowship of worship and of service without regard to differing creedal beliefs. Refusing to meet except each in its own sect's fellowship none were numerous enough to be effective; all who accepted Christ, meeting together on the single-minded basis of that common faith, could successfully hold communion and forward Christianity in their frontier community. Out of this there sprang up a strong conviction that Christian union was demanded by the Gospel, and that all sectarianism was a sin. In working out the basis for union the Campbells soon found themselves proceeding along the historic grounds of authoritarianism and made their appeal from the written creeds of Protestantism to the original Gospel itself. But sincere and faithful minds have always wrought out different interpretations of the Gospels when the simple confession of Jesus as the Christ was passed. It was this inevitable fact that had wrought out the varying creeds. The Campbells came to be convinced that it was the restoration of the apostolic Church in its confession of Jesus as Christ, its ordinances of immersion and the Lord's Supper and in its precedent of a democratic polity, that the hope of union lay. This appeal seemed catholic in that it offered to all the disagreeing sects a common ground on the one name all bore, the Baptism that all alike were able to practice and the sense of Scripture authority for Church government. Not only has the sectarian world of Protestantism refused to be reunited on this basis, but they have turned to accuse the Disciples of being more sectarian than they themselves, charging that they preach union while persistently refusing to unite. The plea for union has apparently been lost in the dogma for restoring the apostolic Church, and the

other communions either think they are quite as apostolic as are the Disciples or else do not accept the necessity of restoring the apostolic forms and ordinances. The simplicity and dogmatic quality of the Disciple plea have won great success, but more as an evangelistic body with a simple, fervent, unquestioned appeal than as an organic means of actual union. Meanwhile the dogmatic temper within has brought one distinct schism and there have been many promises of still another. It should also be noted, as another illustration of this thesis, that the older Christian Church (Newlight) with a like union motif, but with a less dogmatic basis of fellowship in that it does not demand immersion as a basis, has grown in the same period of time to less than one-sixth as great a membership.

Our conclusion is that it will never be possible to obtain organic Church union on the basis of any definite creed, but that the simple Scriptural confession of Jesus as the Christ is sufficient for the inclusion of all His disciples and for the exclusion of all who are not essentially Christian. But this simple confession does not embody sufficient definition to answer all the psychological requirements of men's minds in an age where theological refinements are still thought to be all important. If what one believes is the final test and the only positive assurance of his Christianity then he will demand a more definitive creed, and so long as a more diverse and definitive creed is made the basis of Church fellowship there will be widely differing interpretations and thus deep sectarian cleavages. The minor schisms may be healed in time and the original great denominational families restored to unity, but even that is doubtful except as creedal distinctiveness gives way to practical Christian activity for others. The dogmatic basis for union will never succeed. It prejudices the case and denies the laws of evolution,

and it substitutes belief, which is a means to Christian character, for character itself.

The supreme task of Jesus Christ was not merely to convince men of His incarnation and the theological truths that are tributary to it, but to offer Himself as the incarnate manifestation of God for leading us to become Christian and to make the world Christian. He was never interested in theological correctness within itself and for its own ends. Our belief in Him is a means to an end, and behold we find ourselves so busied in debating over theological correctness that we have not been able to so manifest Him to the world as to bring it to believe. We have thrust our differences upon the Chinese and Indians and confuse the simple appeal of the Christ with the obscurities of our traditional divergences of opinion. It is like refusing to sow the good seed well or to harvest the rich crop advantageously because we cannot agree on which type of farm machinery is theoretically the best. Jesus prayed we might be one in order that the world might be convinced that He was sent, and our failure to answer that prayer among ourselves is the greatest single hindrance to its answer in the world. We deny Him the wide world because we cannot deny ourselves our divisive dogmas.

Modern educational psychology teaches us that the surest way to perfect morals is to do by act of will what we know should be done even though all our habitual and emotional nature is against it. In other words we learn by doing and perfect our spiritual nature by exercising our convictions. The dislikes and antipathies that spring from instinct or ingrained ideas or the training of a certain social inheritance are modified by forcing ourselves to a contact with those who have been made repulsive to us. Personal dislikes are turned into warm friendships by enforced association if the force applied is a will to overcome our own irrational, though natural, attitudes.

Social antipathies are hard and mutually exclusive in the lower phases of civilization and the very index of advancement lies in their softening and breaking to the point of being overcome. Democracy depends upon the lowering of class antipathies and the amalgamating of interests.

So too does religious unity depend upon the erasing of those lines of demarcation that have their source in ancient differences of interpretation. They were rooted in a need that no longer exists, nourished by loyalty to a truth that no longer is distinctive, and grown strong by an opposition that has disappeared. If by some miracle every mark and memory of the denominational divisions in Protestantism could be wiped out in a night and all of us left Christians still, we would never rebuild them as they are. We would inevitably draw lines of social, aesthetic and intellectual groupings, as we do even now within the old denominations, but they would all be generated by the norms and cultures of our own time and not by those of that past which so largely fixes the historic cleavages to which we cling; they would not require organic schisms to express themselves; schools of thought and types of ritual would suffice.

We shall not gain organic union by continuing the historic discussions of faith and order alone, nor ever by making it contingent upon that manner of procedure. So long as men are intellectually immured within them we shall do well to continue that discussion providing the temper is one of conciliation rather than that of the dogmatist. The recent Geneva conference illustrated how utterly impossible it will be for us to agree upon a form of faith and polity as a basis of organic union, even though all accept the apostolic teaching as binding, simply because intelligent and consecrated men, whether Presbyterian, Baptist, Anglican or Greek Orthodox, all believe, and believing assert that theirs is the original apostolic

creed and polity. Either we must choose some line of persuasiveness other than those involving appeal to traditional conviction and historic loyalties or we must find union on another basis than the fundamental agreement to restore apostolic faith (i.e., creed), and order (i.e., form of Church government). Indeed the very insistence at Geneva that the Nicene creed was the minimum would make organic union forever impossible, simply because great bodies of Christians will not only refuse to accept it but will refuse to accept any historic formula.

Our divisions were made necessary by the intolerance of the dogmatic temper inherited from medievalism. The resistance that thrust one after another of the innovating groups out of the older communions has disappeared; the very bodies that thrust them out have often now adopted the creed they excised, and few of them would have compelled withdrawal if the innovation had come to-day instead of in generations gone. We are all made the heirs of the contributions brought by the courageous men who dared excommunication for the sake of teaching them. The great truths are the possession of us all. We are left divided in shell while we are at one in the kernels within. What we need is to find a way to divest ourselves of these vestigial survivals. It is the forms of loyalty and the prejudgments formed for us by social inheritance and the adventitious associations made ours by fortuity that require modification and rebasing. Few Church members deliberately and thoughtfully choose between creeds and denominations to-day. They unite with the Church of their fathers or their neighborhoods or their friends, and the vast majority of us are indoctrinated as members or as novitiates by the chance of family or association. We are taught why this or that or the other creed is correct after we have subscribed to it, so to speak. Our attachments and loyalties are se-

cured by association and fixed by instruction, if indeed they are ever fixed in any manner beyond that of growing fast through habitual association. The great Christian fundamentals are the same. There is nothing in our differences that would save the souls of anyone of us or make us better folk, let alone convince the world Jesus was sent to save it; but in our common agreements there are all the great fundamentals of salvation. Upon them do we build Christian character and in them we all alike induce others to accept the Christ. If we would unite on them alone we could answer the Lord's dying prayer that the world might believe He was "sent as God's Messenger" (Twentieth Century Translation).

This we can do through working together. By act of will we can bring ourselves to do that which the Lord requires. By association in Christian enterprises we always find our group lines breaking down, our sectarian antipathies mellowing, our sense of fraternity and of mutual respect growing, and the bands of brotherhood knitting into unbreakable bonds. We need a refocusing of objectives. Instead of growing denominations because we think them possessed of ways and means in creed and polity that will most effectively promote the world's redemption we must stand ready to sacrifice them in genuine Christian spirit that the Kingdom of God may grow; we must denominationally decrease that the Kingdom may increase. Union will come through putting the promotion of all things good as our objective in place of promoting our denominations as such. If in every community the Churches would join hands in promoting community welfare and if in denominational councils we should begin to outvie one another in offering coöperation in great Christian enterprises, the spirit of unity and the practice of coöperation would lead us irresistibly, in good time, into actual union.

No union can be considered that would compromise

convictions. But the convictions that divide us are so generally prejudgments and in regard to non-essentials that coöperation for the sake of the great common objectives would banish them where they have no right to being and retire them into the category of the non-essential where they have no necessary function. There is abundant diversity among thinking men within the folds of every communion and the liberty of opinion is not in the least imperilled by union on the basis of function. We are not to be judged by creedal conformity, but by the fruits we bear in terms of righteousness. Of all our dogmas we need to ask "what do ye more than others?" Jesus gave the divine prescription in regard to the doctrine of unity as of all else when he said "if any man willeth to do His will he shall know of the teaching." (Jno. 7:17.) The test of effectiveness can be applied by experimentation in methods of promoting Christianity and its righteousness. Efforts in united ways for the great objectives of the Gospel will little by little wear away the dogmas that do not function, and the spirit of holy conquest will overcome the divisive spirit of sectionalism. No programme will bring union in a day * * * but as the mills of God grind slowly they will grind exceeding fine, and in His good time, if we submit humbly to His will, the spirit that divides will be refined into the spirit that makes all men brethren in His Name.

ALVA W. TAYLOR.

Bible Chair, Missouri University,
Columbia, Mo.

HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRESENT DAY EDUCATION?*

I AM told that there lived in a village in Texas four boys, who played together, attended school together and lived in each other's homes as though the home of each were the common property of all four. Apparently they had in themselves the seeds of lifetime friendships until they were sent to their respective denominational schools—Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Baptist and Disciple. That somewhat isolated each from the other, so that on returning home during vacation their friendships were not quite as cordial as formerly.

Later each entered the ministry of his respective denomination and this removed them still further from each other.

The new made Roman Catholic priest claimed his denomination to be *the* Church and his three separated brethren of other denominations to be living in schism and therefore out of *the* Church.

The new made Episcopal priest claimed his denomination to be *the* Church, looking somewhat anxiously toward the new made priest of the Roman Catholic Church, who, however, did not recognize his priesthood, and looking rather indifferently toward the two ministers of the two Protestant bodies, which he termed *the* sects.

The new made Baptist minister claimed his denomination to be the *apostolic* Church, refusing his three friends of the other three denominations and all other Christians the Lord's Supper, which, however, neither the Roman Catholic nor Episcopal priest recognized as the Lord's Supper. He further rebaptized all who sought membership in the Baptist Church, whether they had been baptized by sprinkling, pouring or immersion.

The new made Disciple minister claimed his denomina-

*This paper was read before the annual meeting of the American Society of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York, Dec. 27, 1920.

tion to be the *restoration of the primitive Church*, allowing all Christians at the Lord's Supper, however, but no one of his three friends would come. At the same time he refused membership in his Church to all who had not been baptized by immersion and maintained a critical attitude toward his three friends of the other Christian bodies which he designated as *the denominations*.

This is the grim picture of the educational system of rigid denominationalism with its thorns unconcealed and its barren waste uncovered.

In relating this instance, which can be duplicated many times in principle throughout the world, I would not have you to think that I have in mind the slightest idea of reflecting on the denominations named as though they were sinners above all others. Similar instances have singled out other denominations. The whole Church is involved in this practice, some perhaps not quite as denominational as others, but all are parties to the practice. The men standing apart from each other, ministering at their separate altars, have no doubt honestly stood for the traditions of their respective denominations. They have generally been men of learning and piety. In spite of their separate altars many of them have been voices for God and truth in the world. But is it not pertinent to raise the question whether a system that maintains such a condition is not a fundamental error in present day education?

The beginning of the denominational school may be traced back to the Council of Trent, especially the beginning of theological seminaries. The intention of the originators was to safeguard truth and this was an admirable idea, but the method of separation has been hurtful both to the Church as the message bearer of the truth and to the world as the recipient of the truth. Prior to the Council of Trent the clergy were educated in the universities and consequently they were in touch

with the advance thinking of the world, but with the rise of the denominational school they were not only removed from the centers of thought at the time when the whole world was seeking new paths for thinking, but they unconsciously partook of all that goes with an isolated system of education, including the setting up of a division between religion and reality. Protestantism yielded itself to what it regarded as a necessity in order that its varied, correct interpretations of the Scriptures might become permanent in the thought of the world. Every new movement must have a school of its own and the school in turn perpetuated the movement. No denomination could get fairly under way unless it could point to its own school or schools, where genuine orthodoxy was maintained in the midst of other denominational schools, representing all grades of heresy from extreme to moderate, depending upon the angle of approach. Erasmus says, "The doctrine of Christ, a stranger formally to battle over words, came to be made dependent on defences of philosophy. This was the first downward step towards the ruin of the Church."* The schools of each denomination became the centers of denominational philosophies. All denominations honestly felt that they were divinely called to plant schools wherever they could get a piece of land donated, or its equivalent in money for the purchase of land, and there erect school buildings until in America in particular nearly every denomination is overburdened with its multiplicity of schools.

It is not, however, in the province of this paper to discuss the motives that led to the establishment of these schools nor the multiplicity of denominational schools, nor to inquire as to whether their equipments are poor or ample, or whether their teachers are living on meagre or sufficient salaries, although these elements enter vitally into the education of a nation, and the last report of

*Curtis' "History of Creeds and Confessions," p. 418.

the Commission on Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America says, "The report (survey) called attention to the fact that notwithstanding a widespread and growing interest in religious education throughout the country, and several promising experiments in various centers, yet, taken as a whole, the teaching work of the Churches was alarmingly meagre in amount and ineffective in quality."* Neither is the question raised as to whether the men coming out of the denominational schools are as well equipped in their knowledge of the languages and sciences as the men from other schools. They may be equally as well equipped in those things, but education is not expressed in terms of intelligence. It is rather in terms of conduct and character. William James says, "Education cannot be better described than by calling it the organization of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies of behavior."† But the denominational school breaks the organization, separating themselves according to denominations as though each possessed something which the other did not have and therefore could not impart. Laying aside the fact that the claim is purely fictitious, the policy shatters the spiritual universe into as many parts as there are parties, disturbing the fundamental principles "of conduct and tendencies of behavior."

Education must deal with the wholeness of life. We are in a world of the incomplete. Schools are necessary in order to the development of the incomplete. Education involves both training away from something and training toward something. A system of education may strengthen those inherent elements of social adjustment or it may weaken and divide them, but a system that weakens and divides them is certainly not functioning properly, and such a policy must be a matter of concern

*Report of the Commission on Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, p. 3.

†James' "Talks to Teachers," p. 29.

to all, because it trains the individual away from the real destiny of human life, debarring him from his rightful place in the social whole. Education must be a unitary process or it is defective. The denominational school is not a unitary factor. It may be for its own denomination, but the little less than two hundred units separated as in American Christianity may be ever so well united in themselves, but if these units are not uniting and adjusting themselves to each other for the benefit of the whole, the educational process has not been conducive either to right conduct or proper behavior.

"Education is," as Nicholas Murray Butler says, "a gradual adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race."* The trend of the denominational school is not in the direction of adjustment. It is the guardian of denominational traditions, which are separative in character. Its very presence, whether it teaches its denominational tenets or not, is an attempt to keep alive a breach in spiritual thought, perhaps centuries old or only reaching back a few decades, which then was regarded among the infallible interpretations by its honest advocates, but perhaps now held only as matters of opinion by the honest sons of those same advocates. Consequently the very fact that the denominational school is here, bearing the stamp of a divisive element, although it may not give denominational instruction in the class room, contradicts the unitary processes of present day education and raises at once the question as to the propriety of its continuance as a denominational school.

Times have changed. Severity has been taken out of most denominational teaching, but there is always a rigid side to denominationalism. Canon B. H. Streeter says, "A century ago we were all eyes for the errors of every religious body but our own; to-day we are recognizing the truth in one another's positions; but there is one

*Butler's "Meaning of Education," p. 17.

more stage, and that is for each to awaken to the *errors* in his own views—this is the hardest stage of all.”*

We can approach this stage more satisfactorily if we attempt to approach the error that is common to us all rather than touching some distinctive position that may have lost its interest to other denominations, but is still sacredly guarded by the denomination that originated it or restated it. The common error is the denominational school. That it has grown in efficiency and in general fellowship with the schools of other denominations is apparent to all students of social problems. Nevertheless its system of education, being conducted upon a divisive principle, will train some temperaments to the severity of the original advocates, such as those extremes that may now be found in all denominations, while other temperaments yield to the broadening influences of general education and are fellows with those of other denominations as far as their denominational traditions will let them go. If we find an educational system that pushes an individual away from his fellows, let us not deceive ourselves by thinking that that system of training has in it high merits of education. Such a system always stands for a fundamental error and always will so stand.

The function which education has to discharge is, according to Herbert Spencer, “to prepare us for complete living.”† No institution that represents a party in Christendom, such as a denominational school, can aid to his fullest development a student whose duties are inherently to all Christendom in particular and to society in general. That individual has in him latent powers with the possibilities of adjustment to the highest demands of God and his fellows. Consequently development is a necessity for the completion of manhood and education is the normal aid to that development. It is

*Streeter's "Restatement and Reunion," p. 58.

†Spencer's "Education," p. 44.

not enough that one should be prepared for the other world; he must be prepared for complete living here. That is the purpose of human life as clearly as apple blossoms are the antecedents of apples. Jesus says, "Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect."* We are developed into perfect living in our sphere of human life as God is perfect in His sphere of divine life; and, out of our perfect human life we will come into the perfection of divine life, as the perfect apple blossoms develop into perfect apples, or as the perfect child develops into the perfect man.

Life at best is difficult. There must be an unfettered educational system—unfettered by party attitudes and divisive approaches—if we are to find the art of adjustment to the spiritual necessities of mankind for growth into the ideals of complete living. Education is to train the individual away from the incomplete into the complete, so that breaking with the past is as necessary as union with the future. In the process individuals grow into helping others to find how to grow away from the incomplete into the complete. Education is to remove those barriers, which hinder coöperation, and is not to maintain them. Most of our theological barriers are fictitious, certainly among Protestants. There is not a Protestant theological seminary now, either in this country or abroad, but would produce better ministers if the outstanding Protestant interpretations of the Scriptures were taught under the same roof by those who are the advocates of those interpretations instead of separating students to one interpretation and giving the other interpretations at second hand, which is as uncomfortable to the student's thought as second-hand clothes are to his body. To say the least such a method would tone down many of our Protestant interpretations that need toning down to find a normal adjustment. The same

*Matt. 5:48.

principle applies to Roman Catholicism. Protestants will never understand Roman Catholicism nor will the Roman Catholics ever understand Protestantism until the schools of each are open to both. However independent and arrogant toward each other now, both of these interpretations need each other.

“Truth has nothing to fear in mingling with unbelievers, much less with believers. It is the divine method of its transmission and it mingles better in human flesh than in books. Jesus went Himself among the people and left no commentaries, but left His life, and the spirit of a message is seen in the conduct and behavior of its adherents far more than in its theological statements. Universal fellowship with the saints is the model of God, while exclusiveness is the den of provincialism and sectarianism. It cannot be true that associating with other denominations destroys the truth of another. It may destroy its narrowness and shame its sectarianism, but to its truth is given vision and vitality. He who has convictions can mingle with all Christians and retain those convictions as certainly as, mingling with the thousands on the street, he keeps his individual name. The scourge of a message that has in it the call of God is giving to it a contracted horizon and making it provincial [as every denominational school must do]. It is the violation of a divine principle, for the atmosphere of provincialism is as repulsive as the musty smell of an ill-ventilated room.”* It is abandoning the sunshine of the great universal world for indoor light.

The world abounds in cleavages—cleavages of race, nation, religion, creed and class. It is the function of education to span these cleavages, making a highway to the brotherhood of humanity. The denominational school stands for the cleavage of creeds, whether those creeds are written or unwritten, and consequently it cannot

*Ainslie's "Message of the Disciples for the Union of the Church," p. 40.

function in this task beyond the cry of the prisoner for freedom. No man can teach complete living unless he is approaching it himself, unfettered by denominational barriers. Whatever this generation may be it owes its debt of unitary processes in education to the next generation, if the path of mankind is to go upward toward God.

Present day education needs religion. I do not refer so much to a deepening sense of the recognition of God by both faculties and students, although this is evident, but education is going wild over efficiency to the frequent loss of personality. The tendency is to put production over humanity. A crass materialism is crowding spirituality to the wall, but the voices of the prophets of social adjustment and common betterment are being heard in the great universities as well as in the smaller colleges. The chief question remains—not, What have men learned? but, What have men become? It is the individual's being something himself that is the great and only permanent achievement. This cannot be carried to its fullest development without the freest training of the intellect and the emotions and the will. Religion has its opportunity here, but the denominational school is too archaic an institution to function. Religion in it is frequently below that of the great universities and the reason for this is not difficult to find. Hugh Black says, "I found a greater appreciation of religious matters and interest in them in the state universities than in the denominational colleges."* Others have borne similar testimony.

Politically we would not tolerate here in America the building up by Italians, Russians, Germans, French, Japanese and other nations of schools in their communities in which to teach their national traditions and national peculiarities over all other interests. It would disrupt

*Athearn's "Religious Education and American Democracy," p. 261.

the American republic in a generation. Yet this is what we are doing educationally in the Church of Christ. The denominational school is the denial of unity, which is essential to life: on the other hand, it is the advertisement of discord and competition, which are the elements of death. Happily the tide is turning away from the denominational school as it is from the denominational paper, so that what the denominational school refused to lead the denomination to do, a mysterious hand appears to be guiding in doing; and that tide will never flow back in the opinion of many. So the hopeful condition as regards both education and religion is that the denominational school has seen its best days irrespective of its increasing endowments. Thought is a more powerful factor than money, and present day thought is certainly turning away from the denominational school, and rightly too. Many of these schools in overcrowded centers could be sold to the advantage of mankind and the glory of God; others could be interdenominationalized so as not to reflect merely one interpretation of Christianity, but the whole, as is being done in many instances in foreign missionary work. Standing apart, however, as they are, their messages to the world are neither healthy nor hopeful.

The presence of the denominational school in present day education therefore is a fundamental error because:

1. It follows the prejudices of the denomination and reflects its general thought, whereas the function of a school is to lead the people and to direct the general thought of the community.

2. It is too much absorbed in its own denominational programme at the exclusion of the programmes of other denominations and therefore is concerned with only a part of the Church—and necessarily a small part at that—whereas the function of a school is to cultivate an idealism that is above all divisions, whether those divisions

be Christian denominations or political parties, and to give itself to making practical its ideals.

3. It teaches loyalty to the denomination and attempts to establish a denominational conscience, whereas the function of a school is to teach loyalty to society and to establish a conscience so thoroughly Christian as to include the whole Church.

4. It seeks to conserve the power acquired by its students for the use of its denomination and to make more evident the importance of its denomination in the eyes of the world, whereas the function of a school is to conserve the power of its students for the good of society and to make more evident the blessings of education.

5. It is concerned with the rights of its denomination and the place of its denomination in religious affairs, whereas the function of a school is to emphasize duties to others and service to the community in general.

6. It perpetuates division in the Church and attempts to make sacred the divisions of Christendom as though they were from God, whereas the function of a school is to unify the interests of mankind and to establish the principles of coöperation.

Many of the denominational schools are growing toward the schools in other denominations. They are trying to escape the tragedy of uneducational functioning in which they are involved. Like long ago abandoned pedagogical methods in education, the denominational school is passing and must absolutely pass away in order that the coming generations may have fairer chances for their social adjustments and spiritual possibilities. George A. Coe says, "The standpoint of Christianity, moreover, is that of wholeness of life, from which no human good can be excluded."* The denominational school cannot function in the wholeness of things because it essentially stands for only a part—whether it be the

*Coe's "Education in Religion and Morals," p. 7.

four denominations referred to in the opening of this paper or to the one hundred and eighty-six according to the United States census table. It is an error in education and is therefore unfair to religion and morals and unfair to the present generation which faces great evils over against which stands the denominational school, through which the highest expressions of religion and morals cannot function because of its divisive capacity and schismatic nature.

An institution may serve one generation acceptably, but that is no reason that it is to serve all generations. Things that have been proper at one time have become improper at other times, and things that have been tolerated in one period, perhaps warmly defended by some, have been entirely abolished in other periods. Because an institution has become established in the thought and affections of a respectable group or groups is no reason for its perpetuity. I am not detracting from any good that the denominational school has done in the past. Circumstances in many instances were such that there would have been no school at all in some communities if it had not been denominational, but that day has gone. Another day is here. Prejudice, always unreasonable, has been in many instances in the past so unreasonable that only a denominational school could get financial support, for the money in the Church has usually been in the hands of its most conservative or sectarian elements. This financial support in turn gave a certain rigidity to the standards of the school perhaps unconsciously.

But the rigidity of orthodoxy is the inevitable cause of heresy and schism, so that the ordinary method pursued to establish excessive verbal orthodoxy not only defeats its end of making the whole community orthodox, but produces heresy and schism. Orthodoxy and catholicity rivalled each other for centuries until they separated—one into the Eastern Orthodox Church and the

other into the Roman Catholic Church. This made a definite epoch in the rise of sectarian theology, which developed rapidly following the Council of Trent. Arthur C. Headlam says, referring to this Council, "A wise observer is reported to have said that by the institution of ecclesiastical seminaries the Council exercised greater influence than by any other of its decrees."* That may be true, but as the Greek and Latin forms of Christianity became finally stereotyped in consequence of their division, the many divisions in Protestantism likewise became stereotyped, not so rigidly perhaps as those of the Greek and Latin forms, but nevertheless stereotyped, and the greatest factor to maintain this stereotyped condition is the denominational school. Since then the denominational school is the product of medieval thinking and at the same time is divisive in character, necessarily maintaining in most instances stereotyped attitudes, it is not difficult to see that as an educational institution it can and ought to be abolished. This does not call for the closing at once of all the denominational schools. Only those need to be closed that are in close proximity to other schools and the other denominational schools need to be interdenominationalized. This could be handled by a commission on Christian education.

An interdenominationalized policy would mean that the whole Christian sentiment of the community would be represented on the board of trustees and in the faculty, not with any denomination's predominating and therefore controlling, but with all sharing equally in the responsibility of its conduct and in the interpretation of its message. The only barrier to this policy is sectarianism with its distrust of those in other denominations, with its fictitious attitudes toward others and with its belated sense of its own infallibility. Consequently it will doubtless be hard in many instances for the denominations to

*Headlam's "Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion," p. 203.

let go, but the conscience of the Church must be so trained that it will be uncomfortable for any one denomination to hold with pride the exclusive control of any one school; likewise to be uncomfortable for trustees to hold their places on boards of denominational schools and teachers to hold their places in faculties of denominational schools, where all are members of one denomination. I wish my own denomination would feel this sense of shame of this whole condition and therefore venture toward this ideal.

There must be such an interdenominationalizing policy as to lose sight of the denomination in educational training in order that Christ may be lifted up above all parties and all creeds. Theological seminaries would perhaps have more difficulty in making adjustments, but this is by no means an impossibility. If the various systems of interpretation cannot be adjusted and some one denomination contends that it is impossible for it to be wrong, then we face the alternative of one or the other being false or the still severer verdict, which the world is slowly accumulating, that both are false, but adjustment is possible where there is freedom and truth. This adjustment could begin by having representatives of other denominations to be members of the faculty for short periods with the same freedom of instruction as the denomination in control. Finding this to be the more scientific method of procedure than the present method permanent places would be given in the faculty and on the board of trustees until the theological seminary came to be distinctively Christian, representing the whole Church instead of a denomination and therefore representing only a part. The Church is waiting for such a constructive policy in order to witness to the world the oneness of the disciples of our common Lord. The denominations are able to make this offering in the home land as they are making it to some degree on the foreign field and the altar is the common service to our fellows for the glory of God.

Customs, traditions, property holdings, charter restrictions, endowments and a score of other apparent hindrances stalk across our approaches, but where there is a will there is a way; besides these difficulties have been adjusted in former union movements, such as the union of the Cumberland Presbyterians with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the union in Scotland and in other instances. No greater need ever knocked at the door of the Church than the necessity of these times to interdenominationalize the educational system of the Church and give to education the Christian vision, the Christian adjustment, the Christian fellowship and the Christian wholeness of life.

This day is calling us to repair the breaches of the past, to revise our convictions as to the realities of life, to set up standards that have in them the ethical instincts of the Gospel, to abandon fictitious attitudes regarding race, nation, creed and class, to use the spiritual weapons of divine grace in our daily warfare and to interpret love to sinners and saints in the humility and gentleness of Christ in order that we who believe may be able to present the mind of Christ to a weary world. There is not a denominational school on the globe that alone can do this. The wholeness of the Church is the heavenly viewpoint for the ministering of the whole Gospel to the whole world.

Education must lead us to the fulfilment of those noble ideals for which we hunger and which are beautifully expressed by Wordsworth when he says,

“We live by admiration, hope and love,
And as these are well and wisely placed,
In dignity of being we ascend.”

It is admiration for the true and the universal; it is hope for the ethical use of the five senses and the spiritual development of every possibility within; it is love for

the widening of the horizon, refusing to be provincialized by the petty things of religious denominations, political parties or national affairs and abolishing all hindrances to the wider fellowship with all mankind. The promise of Jesus still lies upon the conscience of a waiting world: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."*

PETER AINSLIE.

Christian Temple,
Baltimore, Md.

THE GOLDEN AGE

THE golden age will dawn
When man shall dare to be
From false ambition free,
His goal the truth;
When every youth
Shall seek, not wealth and fame,
But this—a spotless name.
Righteousness shall be bold
In that fair age of gold.

The golden age will come
When men shall work for joy;
When each shall find employ
Suited to each;
When toil shall teach,
Not bring the soul disgust;
Men will not hear, "Thou must!"
Labor will not be sold,
In that bright age of gold.

The golden age on earth
Will be a time of peace;
The wars of greed shall cease;
Envy shall fail,
Mercy prevail;
Creeds shall not separate;
Caste shall be out of date;
Love shall all hearts enfold
In that fair age of gold.

—THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

*John 8:32.

EDITORIAL

THE ST. LOUIS CONFERENCE

THE first time in the history of the world that all the Christian unity movements were brought together on one platform was at the St. Louis Conference on Christian Unity, held under the auspices of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, February 2-4, 1921. The mere fact of the Conference was of itself significant and the addresses abounded in courtesy, good-will and prophetic vision. Hasty preparation, for the middle west only, covering six weeks, brought together representatives from twenty-two communions from eighteen states, some traveling more than a thousand miles.

Heretofore Christian unity conferences have been made up of carefully selected groups. These would spend days together seeking adjustment. Much fine work has been done by these selected groups. Misunderstandings have been removed and appreciation of the other man's position has been so satisfactorily revised as to make less difficult approaches toward closer fellowship. But the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity felt that the time had come to make a venture in taking this problem to the people for free and frank discussion, so that in the instance of the St. Louis Conference on Christian Unity all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Episcopal and Protestant—were not only invited to attend, but to share in the discussions on the floor of the Conference—not to debate with one side attempting to prove that the other side is wrong, but to confer relative to our divisions and to be free to seek for the path that leads to reconciliation in the Church of Christ. Courtesy and tolerance and freedom marked every session throughout the three days. The

daily press gave satisfactory reports and the Associated Press asked for more copy to be sent throughout the country after being served with what the secretary thought was sufficient.

The programme was very simple. The president of the Association, Dr. Ainslie, outlined the scope and significance of the Conference. Then followed eight brief addresses in answer to the question "What Does My Denomination Mean by 'the Church' and 'Church Unity'?" The order of these answers was as follows: Rev. Edmund Duckworth for the Protestant Episcopalians, Rev. C. B. Spencer for the Methodists, Rev. John Baltzer for the Evangelicals, Rev. W. E. Wheeler for the United Lutherans, Rev. S. H. Woodrow for the Congregationalists, Rev. B. P. Fullerton for the Presbyterians, Rev. F. W. Burnham for the Disciples and Rev. W. H. Geistweit for the Baptists. These statements were referred to the committee on findings and that report will be found in the printed proceedings of the Conference.

Then came the outstanding movements for unity. The Lambeth Appeal was presented by Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot, bishop of Bethlehem, and responded to by Rev. George A. Campbell of St. Louis. The World Conference on Faith and Order was presented by Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., the secretary of the World Conference. The American Council on Organic Union of Evangelical Protestants was presented by Mr. Henry W. Jessup, New York, who was largely responsible for the framing of this plan. The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches was presented by Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, New York, chairman of the executive committee of the Alliance. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America was presented by Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, New York, secretary of the Federal Council. The Universal Con-

ference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work was presented by Rev. Frederick Lynch, New York, one of the secretaries of the Universal Conference. The men who spoke for these organizations were not only officially identified with these organizations, but in most instances were the chief officials. These movements represented the theological, ethical and social approaches to Christian unity. They supplement each other for Christian unity needs all these approaches. Following each presentation two hours were given for questions and discussion.

In addition there were five addresses dealing with Christian unity from the general viewpoint. Canon Samuel McComb, Baltimore, spoke on "Causes of Disunion and the Path to Reconciliation," Rev. Arthur J. Brown, New York, on "Christian Unity on the Foreign Mission Fields," Rt. Rev. Nicholai Velimirovic, bishop of Serbia, on "The Call of a United Church in Europe," Rev. Frederick Lynch, and Rev. Nehemiah Boynton on "Christian Unity and the Present World Situation." It is needless to say that all of the addresses of the Conference were of the highest order and deserve wide reading by those who could not attend. Bishop Nicholai's contribution, rich in mystical interpretation and bold in heroic challenge, came with unusual force to an audience of the Western Hemisphere.

The spirit of the Conference included the whole Church and bore a concern for the redemption of the whole world. Whether men prayed or spoke the dominating thought was for a genuine brotherhood among all Christian believers. Denominational barriers never seemed so superficial as in the atmosphere of this Conference. There was a conscious hunger in the souls of many for something beyond this divisive condition with its multiplicity of unbrotherly attitudes. Men spoke with a cer-

tainty of their faith in the fulfilment of our Lord's prayers for the oneness of His disciples. There are difficulties to brotherhood but God's creative power in us will be sufficient to lead us to overcome every difficulty. It is not our choice, but instead is our necessity. There can be no spiritual growth except it be both toward God and toward all who confess Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. Leaving out a part is hurtful to all. There must be one flock as there is one Shepherd.

No resolutions were passed by the Conference except a resolution of sympathy for our suffering brethren of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Russia. The purpose of the Conference was to awaken a Christian unity conscience over the denominational conscience, thereby including the whole Church in our thought, rather than a minority part, which is the realm of the denominational conscience. The Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Baltimore, Md., is dealing not so much with a plan for union as a method toward union and that method is intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and the distribution of irenic literature. The St. Louis Conference was the first attempt in its programme for an open conference and it was abundantly satisfactory. The week following a similar conference was held in Dallas, Texas, although not so large, and others will follow as opportunity and means are provided. The day has come when Christian unity must be the problem of every Christian and then the problem will be solved.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

THE St. Louis Conference on Christian Unity was one of the most significant Christian gatherings of the year. The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, the leading morning paper of that city, contained more than half a column editorial on the Conference a few days before it convened and nearly a column editorial at the close of the Conference, besides a satisfactory write-up each day during the Conference. The following excerpt is taken from the first editorial:

Whatever may be the objections offered to the movement for Christian unity, the mere fact of movement is proof of life, its energy is proof of vigor, and its broad sweep is proof of power. Nor can it hardly be denied that a movement that seeks to bring separate, conflicting and often opposing elements into common accord for a common purpose fundamental to all, is progressive. There is no Christian denomination that does not exist for the promotion of the cause of Christ. In all the diversities of Christian belief that purpose is primary. It is a fairly well-established rule in human affairs that more can be accomplished for the general welfare by collective than by individual action. The Church in itself, every Church, is a recognition of that rule and an organization in conformity with it. That assumes no lessening of individual power or of individual responsibility, but it does assume that people who have the same fundamental desires and purposes can do more for their attainment by working together than by working each to himself. In every group of people brought together for the accomplishment of certain aims there are personal differences of disposition, temperament, heredity and tradition, from which varying views arise. But if they are agreed as to the particular purpose for which they unite, and can work together for the attainment of that purpose, they can achieve without the sacrifice of any essential of individuality. And so the individual differences among the Churches ought not to present an insuperable obstacle to their getting together for the general advancement of the cause of Jesus Christ. Yet therein is the great difficulty. It is just these individual differences that have so far prevented the consummation of any sort of unity. But when many preachers and eminent laymen of all denominations can get together again and again to talk about unity, and when they continue to do so undiscouraged after repeated failures to accomplish it, the prospect of ultimate success upon some basis of effective coöperation is hardly to be doubted.

In the second editorial it is said,

In closing its fruitful session the Conference on Christian Unity, held the past week in St. Louis, concentrated its thought on international good will. Good will toward men is both the foundation and the essence

of Christianity, and there is no boundary to its application. It begins in the home, it extends to the neighbors, and it goes on, if it is truly Christian, in ever-widening circles to embrace all humanity. But human nature finds it hard to project good will beyond the individual horizon, because the other side of the horizon is unknown or little known, and the unknown is always an object of doubt, of suspicion, and therefore of opposition and enmity. * * * We are mistrusted by many because they do not know us, and we mistrust them because, primarily, we do not know them. Out of this mistrust and misunderstanding grow more occasions for war than from any other cause. What is needed by the world is a better understanding among its peoples, through a closer international coöperation for the common advancement. The League of Nations should contribute potently to such an understanding and the consequent feeling of good will, but there should be behind it, or, rather, beneath it, as its foundation, a public spirit in every country supporting and aiding in the enlargement of international understanding. To that end all Christianity should work together, for Christianity is essentially international, and it is unquestionably the greatest power in the world for the advancement of human welfare. The angels that sang over Bethlehem did not sing peace on earth, good will toward the Jew or the Gentile, toward Roman or Greek, toward American, or German, or Frenchman or Englishman, but toward men, all men, and it is only through the breaking down of barriers of prejudice that separate men that Christianity has progressed as far as it has. Good will toward men is a Christian principle and a Christian duty, and Christianity can and should lead toward the social and political good will which are essential to the establishment of peace on earth.

The Christian Century, Chicago, says,

It was planned for the sessions to be held in the chapel of Second Baptist Church, but at the first session the room overflowed and the assembly was moved to the capacious auditorium, which it came near filling. At the night sessions the house was well filled. Between eight hundred and a thousand persons were in attendance. For three days the various movements for Christian unity were interpreted by authoritative spokesmen and discussed with great freedom from the floor.

This was the first time in American Church history that a common platform has been provided for those who from different angles of approach are working at the task of Christian unity, to come together for comparative testimony and discussion. In providing such a platform the Disciples' Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, headed by Dr. Peter Ainslie and Rev. H. C. Armstrong, has rendered a distinct service to the cause of unity and reflected credit upon the communion which the Association represents. The temper of all the discussions lifted the great theme far above the sectarian levels of controversy and denominational dogma. Each man came as if saying: "This is my conviction; I bear testimony to what seems to me true. What have you to say to it? And what testimony have you to bear to the conviction which you cherish?" A wider and more sympathetic mind was bound to be created in such an atmosphere. Fellowship was discovered where without such candor in conference none would have seemed possible.

The Christian Work, New York, Dr. Lynch editor, says,

Much of the success of the St. Louis Conference was due to two facts: first, Dr. Ainslie got the local Churches thoroughly interested in

the meeting. A very strong local committee was created with Bishop Johnson as chairman and Dr. Bitting as vice-chairman, Dr. MacLeod secretary and Dr. Campbell treasurer. Practically every communion in the city had a delegate on the committee. This committee became the host of the guests. The delegates came from all directions and were cordially entertained by this committee. The other item in the success was the care with which the speakers were chosen. Every speaker, without exception, was a man of international reputation for his interest and work along the lines of organic union of the Churches, world coöperation of the Churches and international good-will. Thus the Lambeth Appeal for Christian Unity was discussed by Dr. Ethelbert Talbot, the Bishop of Bethlehem. Bishop Talbot is one of the five or six bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church who devoted their lives to the promotion of Christian unity and he had much to do with creating the conditions in the Anglican communion that made the action at Lambeth possible. The response of the other communions to this Lambeth Appeal was most happily voiced by Dr. George A. Campbell, another outstanding member of the school of the prophets. These two remarkable statements were followed by an address by Canon McComb of the Cathedral of Maryland, which dealt with the way to reconciliation.

Thursday was given up to a discussion of the various plans and movements for Christian unity now before the world. Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, of Boston, the lay member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, whose name is known throughout the world for his interest in unity, a lawyer and business man who is giving practically all his time, thought and money to the movement, the man who organized the great World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva last summer, was brought on from Boston to tell the story of the Faith and Order movement. The whole morning was given up to conference between Mr. Gardiner and the audience with the result that a clarity of understanding became very noticeable—one that had not previously existed. Thursday afternoon was given over in the same way to a conference on the American Council on Organic Union of Evangelical Churches, led by Mr. Henry W. Jessup, of New York, who was the framer of what has now come to be called the "Philadelphia Plan of Union." On Thursday evening the plans of union already in operation in foreign missionary fields were discussed. Here again Dr. Ainslie brought one of the three men in the United States who knew most about these plans and who has written a great book on this particular subject, Dr. Arthur J. Brown, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. The day's sessions were brought to a close by a remarkable address from the Rt. Rev. Nicholai Velimirovic, the bishop of Serbia, who has just arrived in America to interest the American Churches in his land. His address on "The Call of a United Church for Europe" was a passionate and pathetic plea for fellowship between the Eastern and the Western Churches. One of the most significant signs of the time is the rapidly growing acquaintance-ship of these two great branches of the Church of Christ.

The whole of Friday was turned over to Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, chairman of the International Committee of "The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches," Dr. Macfarland and the writer, for the discussion of Christian unity and the present world situation. The story of the various movements and conferences promoted and conducted by the Federal Council and the World Alliance in Europe, all of which made for the unity of the Churches of the world, was told with some detail to the audience and awakened much interest

and elicited many questions. The addresses of the evening dealt with the world problems facing the united Church.

One very interesting session was given up to representatives of nine communions, each one of whom took ten minutes to tell what his denomination meant when it used the words "Church" and "Unity." Doctors Duckworth, Spencer, Baltzer, Wheeler, Fritz, Woodrow, Fullerton, Burnham and Geistweit—all leaders of their denominations in the Middle West—contributed to a symposium that would really be worth circulating as a separate pamphlet.

The Christian-Evangelist, St. Louis, says,

The conference was not legislative nor yet deliberative. It was essentially informational and inspirational, intended to instruct and to produce conviction. It was informational in two distinct respects. By papers, carefully prepared by representatives of nine different religious bodies, it was advised of the attitude of these respective bodies on the topic, "What Does My Denomination Mean by the Church and Christian Unity?" It was informational also in that there was presented, somewhat in detail, the genius and the purpose as well as present progress, of the movements included in the conference. It was inspirational in that it squarely and optimistically faced the unrest and other abnormal conditions prevailing in the world, across the waters as well as at home, in the full belief that the gospel is the power of God unto social, industrial, economic and political salvation of nations as well as the individual salvation of men.

It was creative, as it was hoped it would be; but, instead of evolving plans it quickened conscience. It is believed that its call will go throughout the world—a call to all who accept the Saviorhood of Jesus Christ and his Lordship, to awake to the imminent peril of a disunited Church. Its every note was one of hope that with the consciences of Christian peoples awakened, there would come the unfolding of plans for the consummation of unity among all believers.

The Living Church, Milwaukee, says,

The general impression made, one of great hopefulness, indicates a general awakening to the need and possibility of closer unity if not complete union. A spirit of tolerance and courtesy characterized the sessions, which does not mean, however, that there were not at times decidedly sharp lines drawn, or that it was always possible to avoid a sort of religious "stepping on toes."

The Evangelical Herald, St. Louis, says,

The plan of having representatives of the different denominations state their beliefs concerning the Church and Christian unity was carried out in a most interesting manner. We believe the cause of Christian unity would be greatly helped if duly authorized spokesmen of the different Churches would, as a matter of general interdenominational information, state briefly in writing the position held by their Churches concerning such fundamentals as the person and the work of Christ, the nature and work of the Church, the meaning of the sacraments, etc., as well as the most important points of denominational polity. A comparison of such statements would show, we believe, that the Churches are much nearer to one another than most of their members imagine.

Again and again the discussions and discourses at the conference

centered around the ideas of Christ's plan for the Church, and the Church's conception of Christ and His work, as the points where the greatest difference of opinion seems to prevail. To the writer, however, it seemed that there was really not so much difference of opinion as a difference in the expression of opinion concerning these Christian fundamentals. Ecclesiastical tradition and training have had so strong an influence upon the terms in which we are accustomed to express our opinions of what we believe to be true concerning the nature and attributes of God, the person and work of Christ, the character of the Church and its work in the world, and the work of the Holy Spirit, that it is difficult for one denomination to fully and clearly understand another's way of looking at and doing things. While it certainly is important to get the historical viewpoint and try to understand the attitude of those Churches which are largely governed by it, the larger hope for unity and final union seems to us to lie in the measure in which the Churches to-day succeed in meeting the urgent and insistent demand for a Biblical, popular message of social righteousness.

The Roman Catholic *Sunday Visitor*, Huntington, Ind., says editorially,

A few weeks ago there was held in St. Louis a Christian Unity Conference, the object being to discuss ways and means for the different Christian sects to unite as one Church.

Every speaker at this Conference, and there were many, deplored the existence of, but had no acceptable remedy for, this "scandal to the unconverted."

We quote briefly from the utterance of several speakers:

"The unity of the Church is as fundamental as the death of Christ on the cross and His resurrection from the tomb."—Rev. Dr. Peter Ainslie, of Baltimore, Md.

This minister is right, because Christ Himself declared that unity of belief and practice among His professed followers would be proof that He was divine. Division is not of God.

"Never since the division in the Church of Christ took place has the need of reunion been felt as it is now. . . . The world war burned into our souls the weakness of a divided Christianity. . . . It is plain that our divisions are a disaster to the cause of Christ. A divided Church is gradually but surely giving us a non-believing world."—Bishop Ethelbert Talbot, of Bethlehem, Pa.

The bishop is also right. Before the division of Christendom a war, such as Europe is just emerging from, was unthinkable. The Head of the Church was the one moral force which both kings and people respected. The discordant voices of several hundred denominations, each claiming that it has the best form of Christianity, explain why the Protestant Churches are making little progress and why two-thirds of the American people are not drawn to any of the Churches.

"Men feel, as they have never felt before, the shame, the scandal and the danger of disunion. They are craving the opening up of some path of reconciliation, whereby ancient grudges shall be wiped out, whereby, without sacrificing any truth which the divine spirit has revealed, men may realize before a hostile world their unity as the one indivisible body of Christ."—Rev. Samuel McComb, of Maryland.

Strange that thoughtful men do not see the unity of the great body from which the parent sects separated. Strange that they do not see the

need of branches being engrafted on the vine in order to live and flourish. Strange that Americans especially do not realize that seceded religions, just as seceded states, must return to the old fold, if we would have real union—one and indivisible. Strange that they do not recognize the need of a “standard of orthodoxy,” some living voice that can speak with authority.

The Baptist *Word and Way*, Kansas City, Mo., says:

These brethren, with all their enthusiasm and good intentions, are visionaries, rainbow chasers. They are spending their time, their breath and their good money for nothing. No desirable Christian unity or Christian union will ever be brought about by such process. Anything that plays down principles, conviction and conscience; anything that minimizes differences and magnifies agreements; anything that finds “non-essentials” in the Word of God and depends upon compromise in order to reach unity, in short, any proposition or effort for Christian unity and union on any other basis than the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, is doomed to failure, and ought to fail. We think of this Unity Conference as a menagerie of doctrine, polity and practices, a “happy family” of non-affinities.

Following the St. Louis Conference a conference was held in the First Presbyterian Church, Dallas, Texas. Of this Conference *The Christian Courier*, Dallas, gives five pages and this excerpt is taken from that paper:

The Dallas Conference was well attended, in consideration of the fact that while the Christian unity question has become an intensely interesting one among the leaders of most communions, there is much timidity yet in this section about the matter.

The Christian Work, New York, says editorially (Dr. Frederick Lynch):

When the great war came it was noticeable how the interest in Christian unity received a new and great impulse. Not only did the Free Churches of Great Britain—Wesleyans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and the rest—begin to talk of union of their forces, but Anglicans and Free Churchmen began meeting on such a footing of intimacy and equality as had never been known before in England. Our readers are familiar with these various meetings and the rather remarkable results. Christian unity has been one of the most discussed questions in England during the last five years. Statements have been given out by the Churches in conference that could not have been arrived at by any group a few years ago. Dozens of books have been published and the whole question is a real, live issue. To some extent this is all true in America.

What are the immediate causes of this new interest in and movement toward unity? First of all, it is the consciousness that has gradually been coming over the Churches that our divided Churches cannot adequately reveal the oneness that exists between Christ and God. Jesus prayed in the Upper Room that His disciples might be one as He and the Father were one—that they might manifest to the world the oneness that was in Him and the Father. Only a united Church will thus manifest the unity that is in Christ. Now Anglicanism manifests one aspect, Presbyterianism an-

other, Methodism another, and so on. When we get a great united Church that is one, then it will gloriously manifest the oneness of the Godhead.

The second reason is the consciousness that has come over the Church that only a united Church can meet the vast, and sometimes organized, evil of the world, solve the problems that are before us, arrest the attention of the indifferent and quench the voice of the scoffer. No one communion is big enough to meet the need of the world or make much impression upon the vast fortresses to be taken, and could the world see a great, strong, united Church of Christ it would not only respect it, but would tremble. No doubt the wonderful success of the Allies when they became *one*, whereas singly they could not conquer, had much to do with deepening this impression.

In the third place, a feeling has been coming over the Church that no one communion is big enough to contain the whole revelation of God. Bishop Brent emphasized this fact very strikingly in his opening address as chairman of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva. The Lambeth Conference at London in July put it in most striking language. The Appeal of the bishops says: "The faith cannot be adequately apprehended . . . while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ."

Regarding sacramental grace, which is so involved in Christian unity discussion, Canon Adderley, writing in *Hibbert Journal* says:

We must remember that Christianity is a very young religion, and that we are only at the beginning of Church history, even now. Catholic mystics and the Society of Friends have found silence and contemplation more sacramentally efficacious than the ordinary sacraments. The author of the fourth Gospel does undoubtedly describe the feet-washing as a kind of sacrament ordained by Christ, just at the point where we should have expected him to tell us about the Lord's Supper, especially in view of what he had already written in his sixth chapter. Many Christians who seldom or never communicate do seem to get grace from action which is more like feet-washing than like eating bread and drinking wine.

These facts, and many others of the same nature, should make us very chary of claiming too much in the way of special sacramental grace to be got in no way except by the appointed channels. Let us concentrate on the end for which we look rather than on the means we use, however venerable. Anyhow, that is the way to preliminary agreements. The hem of Christ's garment became a sacrament of Christ's virtue to the woman who wanted Him, while it was nothing to those who pressed it without the desire for that end.

We need also to reconsider what we mean by grace, of which the sacraments are said to be the means. There is a tendency to talk of grace in terms of quantity, as if it were so much measurable stuff like the grease of a wheel or the fuel of an engine. But we cannot really measure spiritual force in that sort of way. We do not get twice as much inspiration by reading two plays of Shakespeare as we should if we only read one. Neither are two communions necessarily better than one. The very phrase "my communion" suggests a mechanical view of grace. Had not Cardinal Manning some thought of this kind in his mind when he deplored the fact that many of his priests had become mere "sacrament-mongers"? Grace is spiritual power, a force of suggestion, encouragement, inspiration, but needing the coöperation of the will of the receiver to make it really efficacious. The Church may be right in rigidly adhering to a

fixed number of sacraments and a regular way of obtaining valid gifts of grace, but the door should not be closed so that a faithful and enthusiastic Christian should not be encouraged to expect grace in all sorts of ways. As a matter of fact, the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of her severely exclusive and mapped-out doctrines, does encourage her children to look for what is practically extra-sacramental grace. Chiefly this is done in her insistence on hearing Mass.

I was taught as a boy (by Anglican clergy) that I must be careful not to think that there was any special grace in attending the Eucharist without communion; that it could only come from actual partaking of the elements. I believe now that this was a mistake. Hearing Mass, or, as our continental fellow-Christians call it in a most suggestive phrase, "assisting" the priest, does also confer grace in the sense in which I have tried to define it above. It appeals to the imagination. Christ crucified is "placarded" before our eyes. We behold in a magnificent yet simple drama the only perfect approach to God, through a sacrificed body and a poured-out life-blood. Now, this seems to me a most important concession that has been made by Catholics in the matter of grace, because we cannot say that hearing Mass is strictly part of the original institution of the Eucharist, or, at least, not a grace-conveying part of it. If the Holy Spirit has taught the Church this extra-sacramental source of grace, how do we know that He may not be teaching other ways to those who do not use the ordinary sacraments?

I hope I shall not be misunderstood. I absolutely believe in the sacraments myself. The Holy Communion is to me the great assurance that Christ is a living Master and King. I feel about it what Maurice felt when he said: "If I had not been to Communion this morning I should be inclined to say that the devil reigned." Just at this time, when the Bible is ceasing to be a complete historical bedrock on which to rest, it is the sacraments which embody and keep alive and moving the spiritual realities for which the first disciples and martyrs lived and died. What the spoken words and visible deeds of Jesus were to the disciples, I believe the sacraments are meant to be to us. The Church itself is the arch-sacrament, the visible embodiment of Him in whom dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily. The communicant without faith, without the desire for unity, does not discern the Lord's body. The sacraments might be, if lived out to the full in everyday life, just that visible proof for which in these days the world is asking, that Christianity is not played out. It is by trying to make the sacramental life a reality that the socialist clergy have found an inspiration for their work, and it was no mere form of words which made Stewart Headlam, when founding the first socialist society in England nearly forty years ago, adopt as its first rule "to make the Eucharist the chief act of Christian worship." Somewhere underlying this feast of the common bread there must be the principle which in God's good time will bring into one active, coöperative body all who name the Name of Christ.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

PRIEST OR PROPHET—A REPLY TO DR. HODGE

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY:

Dear Sir:—I have given Dr. Hodge's letter very careful attention, but as it does not seem to be conclusive, perhaps you will allow me to state my reasons for thinking, even yet, that my article was nearer the truth than Dr. Hodge's view.

He challenges my definition of the distinction between a prophet and a priest, and says that a more exact definition be, that a prophet is one who speaks to man on behalf of God, and a priest is one who acts as the agent both of men in their approach to God, and of God in His dealings with men. In support of this he argues that the priest acted as God's representative when he accepted the sacrifices of the people and performed the necessary rites. But I maintain that all through the processes connected with sacrifices the priest was the people's representative and not God's. This is clear from Heb. 5:1, where the entire work of offering from beginning to end is spoken of as expressing man's relation to God through the priest, and, so far as I can discover, Scripture never divides the offering in the way Dr. Hodge suggests. In everything the priest did he was "appointed for man" and was man's representative, not God's.

Dr. Hodge includes the act of blessing in these priestly functions, but he has forgotten that blessing was not limited to the priest, for a king could bless, and therefore blessing was not a priestly work, as such. This is all the clearer from the story of Uzziah who was punished for intruding into the proper and sole sphere of the priest.

My object was to get and state a clear definition of the essential difference between the prophet and the priest, and I felt sure the only way of doing this is to say that the prophet represented God to man and the priest represented man to God. Whatever else either of them did was not of the essence of their specific functions.

Dr. Hodge considers Christ's statement, "as my Father hath sent me," etc., supports his view and he bases it on what he regards as Christ's own priesthood at the time. But he has evidently forgotten the plain denial of Christ's priesthood on earth in Heb. 8:4, than which nothing could be clearer in refutation of Dr. Hodge's position. Christ did not begin to be a priest until His Ascension, and we are told of His priesthood that it is "intransmissible" or "undelagated," that is, it does not pass from Him to anyone else (Heb. 7:24, Greek). Besides, when Christ spoke the words recorded in John 20, one of the Apostles was absent, and, as the best commentaries point out, there were others present as well as the ten Apostles. Further, remission of sins was no priestly function, for Dr. Hodge may be challenged to produce a single case of this on the part of the Aaronic priest. The popular phrase "priestly absolution" is a contradiction in terms, for the work of absolution or remission, in the only possible sense of declaring God's absolution as in the Prayer-Book service, is the work of a prophet not of a priest.

There is evidently some confusion in Dr. Hodge's mind when he speaks of Baptism as a priestly function, for the Church in all ages has recognized the validity of lay baptism. So, too, as to the Lord's Supper, there is no proof that it was to take the place of the Jewish sacrifices. On the contrary, Christ Himself, not the Supper, is the anti-type of the Passover (1 Cor. 5:7), and the clear teaching of Hebrews is that all the old sacrifices found their fulfilment in Him.

Dr. Hodge speaks of the Lord's Supper as a "memorial," but the word used by our Lord was "remembrance" (*ἀνάμνησις*) it is well known that this is subjective, as distinct from the objective "memorial" (*μνημόσυνον*).

The laying-on-of-hands in the Acts was not limited to the Apostles even though they were priests (which they were not), for a layman, Ananias, was the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit being given to St. Paul. Nor is there the slightest proof that the "sealing" of Ephesians was our confirmation.

Dr. Hodge uses "we have an altar" as though it referred to the Lord's Table (which, by the way, is never called "altar" in the English Prayer Book), but the context is clearly against this view, and Westcott points out in his fine commentary that the term "altar" was not used of any material structure for over a century after the date of Hebrews.

Dr. Hodge uses Moberly's well known argument when he says that the whole body of believers cannot act as one in performing priestly functions. It must have representatives to act for the whole body in its corporate approaches to God and there must be some one to celebrate and administer the acts which Christ commanded, and His Apostles preached, by means of which spiritual blessings are received from God.

But I maintain that there is nothing of a strictly priestly (that is representative) character that every believer cannot do for himself. Here, again, there is some confusion, for in public worship the clergyman is a medium not a mediator, and his work of leading our devotions and presiding at our communions does not set aside or even suspend the priesthood of all believers.

The rest of the letter does not seem to call for detailed comment, except to say that the functions of the ministry in the Reformed churches are not priestly but ministerial in every sense, and on this account the divergences between these Churches and Dr. Hodge's position are not merely a matter of "nomenclature" but of "fact."

The truth is that Dr. Hodge has been reading back into the New Testament his own ecclesiastical views which are of a very much later date as to origin. In this he is like Bishop Gore, and I would strongly suggest a careful study of that fine book recently published by Dr. Headlam on "The Church and Reunion" where the true method of approaching all these controverted subjects is forcibly and convincingly stated.

Yours most faithfully,

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

129 Maplewood Avenue, Germantown, Pa.

AMONG NEW BOOKS

The four Bedell Lectures of 1919, under the title *The Call To Unity* by William T. Manning, S.T.D., D.C.L. (Macmillan), make one of the very best contributions to the cause of a united Christendom. The titles of the lectures are "The Call to Unity," "The Present Outlook for Unity," "The Approach to Unity," and "The Call to the Anglican Communion," followed by a valuable appendix of forty pages. Dr. Manning is bold to say that our divisions are a disaster to the cause of Christ, divorcing religion from our system of public education, weakening and impairing the whole body of Christians, and making an insuperable obstacle to the command of our Lord to make disciples of all nations. Unity involves spiritual reality and divine purpose. "The Church is the means which God has appointed for bringing to Himself all mankind, in the fellowship of His dear Son. It is the Church which gives the Gospel actuality and meaning." But our separations and divisions have led many of us to a poor and inadequate view of the Church which Dr. Manning deplors and affirms that we are all guilty of the sin of schism, and the question is not as to the origin of schism, but as to the longer continuance of it.

His outlook is hopeful, realizing that the things which unite Christians are greater than the things which separate them. He recognizes the spiritual excellencies of the Roman Catholic Church and sees the possibility of a "constitutional Papacy." He regards the American Council on Organic Union as putting forth the most important and promising action yet taken toward Protestant union. The vision of a united Church is from Christ and because it is from Him it will be fulfilled. Many approaches are cited, indicating a growing conscience, and he emphasizes the necessity for a clear exposition of the meaning of unity. He emphasizes the principles of Christian loyalty and Christian liberty and speaks wisely of the possibility of Catholic and Protestant interpretations supplementing each other for the necessary wholeness of the Church. The last lecture deals with the Anglican Church, recognizing and finding place for both the Catholic principle and the Protestant principle within her own life. Its appeal is bold, inclusive and spiritual, making a distinct contribution to the common brotherhood of Christians, and we find ourselves in satisfactory agreement with the whole presentation.

The story of the first quarter of a century of *The World's Student Christian Federation* is fascinatingly told by Dr. John R. Mott in a volume of less than a hundred pages under that title (World's Student Christian Federation), dealing with its origin, achievements and forecast, illustrated. Its birthplace was at Vadstena Castle, Sweden, in 1895, and to six men was committed the great task of laying the foundation for a movement which in time has become a vast superstructure, uniting the student Chris-

tian movements throughout the world, collecting information regarding religious conditions of students in all lands, leading students into Christian discipleship, deepening their spiritual life and enlisting them in extending the Kingdom of Christ throughout the world. Naturally out of such a movement one of its outstanding results has been the advancing of Christian unity, revealing to Christian students with compelling force their oneness in Jesus Christ. It has illustrated the reality and advantages of the unity of Christian believers, uniting in effective organization and endeavor nearly 200,000 students and professors, and in this particular has made one of the greatest contributions to the unity of Christendom. The study of the needs of the world from the point of view of Jesus Christ has shown the necessity and practicability of sincere coöperation and common action among Christians, promoting corporate thinking and united intercession. No body of men so thoroughly realize the new era in which we now live as students, and the forecast presented by Dr. Mott opens into a field of boundless possibilities. It is a record of charm, vision and challenge.

One of the most beautifully written books of personal recollections is *Personal Recollections of Andrew Carnegie*, by Frederick Lynch, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union (Revell). Dr. George Haven Putnam, in the second volume of his reminiscences, related some things that Mr. Carnegie said on shipboard, which, while doubtless true, misrepresented rather than represented Mr. Carnegie's religious views, but it went around the world as a suggestive theme for editorials in religious journals. At the same time those same journals in the main were upholding wholesale man killing in war as being in conformity to the mind of Christ, while Mr. Carnegie was giving both his thought and his fortune to abolish war and to establish an international court of justice where international disputes might find their solution. He rightly believed that he was interpreting the mind of Christ and he just as positively believed that sectarianism did not represent the mind of Christ and therefore he stood aloof from the Churches as Abraham Lincoln and multitudes of others have done. Nevertheless Mr. Carnegie expressed high confidence that in spite of the divisions of the Church he looked to the members of these religious bodies to be the chief instruments in banishing war from the earth. Dr. Lynch knew Mr. Carnegie intimately, and aside from his remarkably gifted pen, perhaps there is no one who could better interpret Mr. Carnegie's life than Dr. Lynch, who has given an interpretation that will not only be as a supplement to Mr. Carnegie's "Autobiography," but will ever remain a fascinating volume to those who are interested in the most human side of the life of a great man.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.



CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1920-1921

DATE	ISSUED TO

